THE EARLY HISTORY
OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCH

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/earlyhistoryofch0003mons_h4v1

WITHDRAWN

SEMINARY LIBRARY
PASSIONIST FATHERS

EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, FROM ITS FOUNDATION TO THE END OF THE FIFTH CENTURY.

Vol. I. To the End of the Third Century. 12s. net.

Vol. II. The Fourth Century. 15s. net.

All Rights reserved

EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

FROM ITS FOUNDATION TO THE END OF THE FIFTH CENTURY

BY MONSIGNOR LOUIS DUCHESNE

HON. D.LITT. OXFORD, AND LITT.D. CAMBRIDGE
MEMBRE DE L'INSTITUT DE FRANCE

VOL. III.—THE FIFTH CENTURY

ENGLISH TRANSLATION
BY CLAUDE JENKINS

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON
LAMBETH LIBRARIAN

The Catholic
Theological Union
LIBRARY
Chicago, Ill.

NEW YORK
LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
55 FIFTH AVENUE
1924

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
OLIVER AND BOYD, EDINBURGH

7654

PREFACE

THE fifth is a melancholy century: a century of ruin and of tottering to a fall. The Roman Empire collapses in the West beneath the weight of assailants more unconscious of their strength than malignant in intention, the victim of its own internal weakness rather than of the blows which it received. In the East it still holds its ground, because it has not been seriously attacked. Though not as yet hemmed in by Slavs on the one side and Arabs on the other, it struggles without against the pressure of the barbarian and the menacing proximity of Persia, and within its own borders against centrifugal elements which begin to notify to it in Coptic, in Syriac, and in Armenian their defection from a hegemony which was Greek.

The Church might have lent its aid in overcoming the forces of disintegration, but the Church too is in convulsion. It wins, it is true, a decisive triumph over Paganism; but this victory is itself the source of tremendous difficulties for the Church in adjustment to the position. Every one is Christian. Could every one be so in reality? To this question the monks returned a denial often extravagant in its absence of qualification. Other people made the best they could of the situation and tolerated in the practice of the Christian life a distortion of the noble ideal of early days. In the field of doctrine rival schools dash themselves into collision, parties wax hot and engage in strife. The lesson of the century before and of its deplorable dissensions goes absolutely for nothing. Men whose opinions are at bottom the same, anathematize each other for modes of expressing them. Rather than yield on the use of words they set Alexandria in conflict with Constantinople, the East with the West. Christian unity is sacrificed to the unprofitable defence of personal feeling.

Still, we must not exaggerate the details. To take a single

instance, we must be carefully on our guard against supposing that the cause of this turmoil in theology was a serious doubt as to the Tradition. That had long been fixed. Like those of our own day the Christians of that time had received from their fathers the Faith in Jesus Christ truly God and truly Man. Their divisions from one another had to do only with methods of explanation (*modalités*), nay with less still, with questions of terminology. The monk Barsumas would have brained us if we had not said, like St Cyril, that there is only One Nature in Jesus Christ. Yet, if we analyze, not the content of Barsumas' dull brain but the teaching of his master Cyril—his teaching as a whole, that of his acts as well as that of his writings—we readily discover that Cyril, in spite of his "Single Nature," can be reconciled with Leo, Flavian, and Theodoret, who postulate Two Natures. All that has to be done is to arrive at a common understanding. But with the warlike temper of the theologians it is not the common understanding which matters, but the conflict.

A melancholy century!

Yet, happily, we meet in it with many figures that are picturesque and even attractive. Some of them call for a little, even for much, indulgence. This or that saint of this period would not perhaps have passed without some difficulty through our modern processes leading to canonization. That is no concern of ours. Only it must be clearly understood that hagiographical positions which we accept, without taking stock of them, as the centuries have handed them down to us, cannot change the balance of the judgements of the historian. Besides, it is seldom that these figures of saints, however imperfectly their characteristics may seem to harmonize, do not exhibit some congenial traits. Epiphanius and Jerome were loved and revered in their lifetime by saintly people who knew them personally. Cyril of Alexandria in one crisis showed himself a leader resolutely in favour of peace when the army which he led was little moved by such sentiments, and he deserves great credit for it.

For St Augustine, at any rate, we have no need to plead extenuating circumstances. He stands upon an eminence entirely by himself. From his far-off African home his influence extended over the whole of Christendom. To the men of his own day he spoke the words which met their needs.

He knew how to express for them the aspirations of their souls, to console them for the troubles of the world, to direct their thoughts through the deep problems of religion. He was kindly to all. It was by him that the frenzy of enthusiasts was stilled, the ignorant were enlightened, thoughtful minds kept true to the faith they had received. He was the teacher of the whole of the Middle Ages. In our own day still, after the decline inevitable to a supremacy of such long duration, he remains the great authority in theology. And above all it is through him that we get into touch with Christian antiquity. From some points of view he belongs to all ages. His soul, and what a soul it is! has passed into his writings; in them it still lives. There are some of his pages on which men will always shed tears.

The fifth century was a century of writers. It is *par excellence* the century of the Fathers of the Church. History here has an enormous library at its command. Jerome and Augustine, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Theodoret have left us an imposing mass of completed works, treatises, sermons, and letters, which are storehouses of information. The discussions of the great Councils and the controversies which they evoked have been responsible for the production of formal records of proceedings and of collections of official documents. All this material has for long years been at the disposal of the historian. To this ancient stock modern researches have made some important additions. Various works, historical or of other kinds, have been recovered in Syriac manuscripts; unwearied Orientalists are busying themselves in giving them to the world. Useful monographs[1] have been produced on particular points on which, whether as the result of controversies or for lack of information, obscurity remained.

Some of this still remains. Workers, far more numerous than they used to be, who have entered upon this field or will do so in the future, will long have subjects on which to exercise their abilities. Yet even now, it may fairly be said, we know far better than the contemporaries of Tillemont the true condition of the controversies which were debated after the Councils of Ephesus and of Chalcedon. For example, it is no longer possible for us to allow ourselves to be imposed upon by

[1] Especially those of Loofs and Krüger, either in the shape of lengthy articles in Hauck's *Encyclopädie* or in separate works.

such labels as "Nestorians" and "Eutychians," which for the most part in contemporary writings represent only polemical devices, indeed mere terms of abuse, and in no way correspond to the real classification of religious parties.

If documents abound, the same can by no means be said of historical narratives. We have no longer Eusebius, nor even Socrates. The latter does not go far into the fifth century, and his two companions of the same calibre, Sozomen and Theodoret, scarcely mention it. To find another historian of the Church, we have to go down as far as Evagrius, that is to the end of the sixth century. There were such historians, however, men like Hesychius of Jerusalem, Basil of Cilicia, John of Ægeum, Zacharias of Gaza, and Theodore the Reader. But of their works we now possess only fragments of greater or less extent. The Chronicle of Theophanes, in the ninth century, laid these writings under contribution, especially that of Theodore the Reader; but Theodore's text appears there parcelled into small pieces often badly arranged and not easily to be connected together again. The contemporary chroniclers, Prosper, Hydatius, and Marcellinus, are still more dismembered and still more incomplete. The result of this is seen in some measure of doubt as to the chronological order of certain facts. But this is a small matter. The history of the Church includes few periods which are so well known or at least which admit of being so well known as that which will be dealt with in this volume.

ROME, *February* 2, 1910.

NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR

An effort has been made to reproduce Mgr. Duchesne's words as faithfully as possible, even at the sacrifice of smoothness of expression. For any failure to do justice in this volume (for which alone he is responsible) to the reputation of a scholar whose memory he holds in reverence, the translator can only express affectionate regret. He has ventured to add an Index.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE, ... v

CHAPTER I

THE CHURCH IN THE DAYS OF THEODOSIUS I. AND II.

The decay of the Empire. Christian morality. The aristocracy and the masses. Penitential discipline. Developments of public worship. Popular religion; the cultus of the Saints, of Relics and of Images. Theology. Progress of the Hierarchy. The election of Bishops. Groupings of the Episcopal body. Ecclesiastical legislation. Monks and monasteries, . . . 1

CHAPTER II

ORIGENISM AND ST JEROME

Origen, doctor and controversialist. Evagrius the monk. Rufinus, Epiphanius, Jerome. Journey of Aterbius. Jerome's change of attitude. John, Bishop of Jerusalem. Epiphanius in Palestine. His quarrel with John. Ordination of Paulinian. Conflicts. Intervention of Theophilus. Transient peace. Rufinus returns to Italy. He publishes the *Peri Archon*. Pope Anastasius. Theophilus and the Nitrian monks. He proscribes Origen. His expedition to Nitria. Exodus of the Origenist monks. Origen condemned at Rome. Position of Rufinus. His controversy with St Jerome. His literary works, . . 27

CHAPTER III

CHRYSOSTOM AND THEOPHILUS

The successors of Theodosius: Stilicho, Rufinus, Eutropius, Gainas. Archbishop John. His reforms, his preaching, his relations with the Arians and the Goths. Forces of opposition which he

PAGE

arouses. Rivalry of the Alexandrian Patriarchs to the Bishop of the Capital: their power. The monks of Nitria at Constantinople. Arrival of Epiphanius: his death. Theophilus appears on the scene. Council of the Oak: deposition of John. His departure: his return. Affair of the statue of Eudoxia. John disgraced: his exile. Schism and persecution. John's appeal: intervention of Pope Innocent. Death of John in exile. Attitude of Jerome, ... 49

CHAPTER IV

THE END OF DONATISM

Return of the Donatist clergy in Julian's reign. Romanus the Count. Parmenian. Optatus of Milevis. Tychonius. The Rogatists. Revolt of Firmus. The Councils under Genethlius (390). Gildo the Count and Bishop Optatus. Schism under Maximian: Councils of Cabarsussi and Bagai. Revolt of Gildo. Augustine. Council of Hippo. Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage. Reception given to the converted Donatists. Inquiries regarding the followers of Maximian. Augustine's activity. The Donatists summoned to a Conference. Their refusal and acts of violence. The schism abolished by law (405): imposition of unity. The Conference of 411. Marcellinus the notary: his death. Spreading of unity. Emeritus of Cæsarea. Gaudentius of Thamugad, 76

CHAPTER V

ALARIC

Weakness of the Western Empire. Alaric and Stilicho. Taking of Rome. Gaul a prey to the Barbarians. The Emperors of Arles. Athaulf in Gaul and in Spain. The "Patrician" Constantius. Christians of strict views. Prudentius. Paulinus of Nola. Sulpicius Severus. Postumianus. Vigilantius. Remnants of Arianism in Illyricum: Maximin. Bonosus of Naissus. The "Vicariate" of Thessalonica. Nicetas of Remesiana. The Episcopal Hierarchy in Italy. Roman Society. The Probi. The Friends of St Jerome. The Valerii: Melania the Younger. Melania the Elder reappears in Rome. Her grandchildren sacrifice their fortune. The downfall of Rome. Sensation which it produces. The *City of God* and the *History* of Orosius. After the invasion, ... 104

CHAPTER VI

PELAGIUS

PAGE

Demetrias the Virgin. Pinianus and Melania in Africa. Beginnings of the controversy on Grace and Original Sin. Doctrines of Pelagius and of St Augustine. Pelagius at Rome and in Africa. Celestius: his condemnation at Carthage. Pelagius in Palestine. Attitude of Jerome and of Orosius. Council of Diospolis. The troubles of Jerome. African Councils. Pope Innocent condemns Pelagius and Celestius, ... 140

CHAPTER VII

POPE ZOSIMUS

Accession of Pope Zosimus. Patroclus of Arles, Heros and Lazarus. Celestius and Pelagius find a welcome at Rome. Intervention of the Africans. Definitive condemnation of Pelagianism. Zosimus and the African bishops. Affair of Apiarius. The canons of Sardica. Death of Zosimus. Schism under Eulalius. Pope Boniface. African Council of 419. Affair of Antony of Fussala. Second affair of Apiarius, ... 159

CHAPTER VIII

AUGUSTINIANISM

Pelagian opposition. Julian of Eclanum. His controversies with St Augustine. The Pelagians and the Western Empire. Pelagianism in Britain: St Germanus of Auxerre. Reaction against the extreme views of St Augustine. The monasteries of Lérins and of Marseilles. The last writings of Augustine: his death. Cassian, Prosper, Vincent of Lérins. Attitude of the Holy See, ... 181

CHAPTER IX

ATTICUS AND CYRIL

The successors of Arcadius. Atticus and the followers of John. In Egypt: Theophilus, Synesius, Isidore of Pelusium, St Nilus. Death of Jerome. Antioch: reunion of the followers of Paulinus and of John. John's memory cleared at Constantinople. Cyril of Alexandria: his early days. Massacre of Hypatia. Messalians and Akoimetoi. The monks of Constantinople. St Simeon Stylites, ... 201

CHAPTER X

THE TRAGEDY OF NESTORIUS

PAGE

Sisinnius, the successor of Atticus. Nestorius and the heretics. The question of the "Unity" of Christ. The term "Mother of God." Unguarded sermons of Nestorius. His relations with Rome. Leporius, Cassian, Marius Mercator. Intervention of Cyril. He is commissioned by Pope Celestine. His Anathemas. The Easterns. Meeting of the Council of Ephesus. Cyril deposes Nestorius. The Easterns depose Cyril and Memnon. Conflict. Intervention of the Court. Banishment of Nestorius. The two parties send representatives to Chalcedon. Maximian, Bishop of Constantinople. The council disperses. The Eastern schism. Mission of Aristolaus. Difficult position of Cyril. The Peace of 433. Official severity against Nestorius and his supporters. Disputes in regard to Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. The Tome of Proclus, . . 219

CHAPTER XI

THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON

Death of Cyril and of John. Dioscorus, Domnus, Ibas, Theodoret. Confidence of the Easterns: Irenæus, Bishop of Tyre. Flavian succeeds Proclus. The Chamberlain Chrysaphius. Importance of Eutyches. His conflict with the Easterns: the Government supports him. Flavian deprives him. The doctrine of Eutyches and the formulas of Cyril: the "Two Natures." Roman opinion: the Tome of Leo. The Second Council of Ephesus: rehabilitation of Eutyches, condemnation of Flavian and the Easterns. Death of Flavian: succession of Anatolius. Leo quashes the Council of Ephesus. Death of Theodosius II. Reaction under Pulcheria and Marcian. Summoning of the Council of Chalcedon. Repudiation of the Council of Ephesus. Personal questions: Dioscorus, his accomplices, the Egyptian bishops, the monks. Definition of Faith. Presence of the Emperor. Rehabilitation of Theodoret and of Ibas. The revenge of Nestorius. His end, ... 271

CHAPTER XII

THE MONOPHYSITES

End of the Council of Chalcedon. Patriarchates of Jerusalem and of Constantinople. Opposition of the Pope. Monophysite rising at Jerusalem. Theodosius the monk and the Empress Eudocia.

PAGE

Proterius, Bishop of Alexandria, his difficulties, his tragic end. Timothy Ælurus. Consultation of the Episcopate. Ælurus exiled. The Emperors after Marcian: Leo, Zeno, Basiliscus. Return of Ælurus. The Encyclical of Basiliscus. Opposition of Acacius of Constantinople. Affairs at Antioch. Progress of the Monophysite party. Peter the Fuller. Daniel the Stylite. Restoration of Zeno. The *Henotikon*. Peter Mongus and the Acephali. Position in Syria: the *Crucifixus pro nobis*. The Opposition party in Palestine: Peter of Iberia. Acacius deposed by Pope Felix III. Schism between Rome and the Greek Church, ... 316

CHAPTER XIII

CHRISTIANITY EAST OF THE EMPIRE

Christian foundations in the Caucasus. The Church in Georgia. Armenia and its political vicissitudes. Conversion to Christianity. Tiridates and Gregory the Illuminator. Organization of the Armenian Church. Its history in the 4th century: Narses, Sahag. The Wars of Religion in 450 and 481. Vahan Mamigouni. The Persian Church: its origins. Persecution under Sapor II. Aphraates and his Homilies. The Catholicate of Seleucia. Marutas and the Council of 410. Relations with the Churches of the Empire: Acacius of Amida. Armenia passes over to Monophysitism, Persia to Nestorianism. Arabian developments of Christianity in Eastern Syria. Churches founded in the territory of Axoum and among the Homerites. The Gospel in the Indian Ocean, ... 360

CHAPTER XIV

THE WEST IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

The Empire in the days of Aetius. The Priscillianists of Spain. Turribius of Astorga. Hilary of Arles: his disputes with Pope Leo. St Germanus of Auxerre. Attila. The Councils in Armorica. Sidonius Apollinaris. Salvian. Faustus of Riez. The Church of Britain. St Patrick, Apostle of Ireland. Gildas. The Vandals in Africa. Religious Policy of Genseric. The Persecution under Huneric. St Eugenius of Carthage. Victor of Vita, ... 401

CHAPTER XV

THE ROMAN CHURCH IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

PAGE

The Empire in its agony. Ricimer and the last Emperors of the West. Odoacer and Theodoric. Catholic Rome. Disappearance of the Novatians. The Manicheans and Pope Leo. Pelagians and Eutychians. The Arians. The Holy See and the Churches of the East. The jurisdiction of the Pope. Episcopal Elections; Roman Councils. The Pope and the Latin Church. The Secular Arm, ... 445

INDEX 471

EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

CHAPTER I

THE CHURCH IN THE DAYS OF THEODOSIUS I. AND II.

In uniting itself closely to the State, the Church under Theodosius was not making a good match: it was wedding a sick man, soon to become a dying one. A strong and determined ruler who as the beginning of his career had extricated the empire from a frightful disaster, who had caused it to be respected by the barbarians and had twice repressed dangerous rivals to his authority, was succeeded by two poor young princes, wilted blossoms of the women's quarters; and under these what little vital force the old worn-out body still retained was soon seen to fade away, leaving no fruit behind.

And the force that remained was little enough. In its early days Rome justified its hegemony by the services which it rendered to the world in the maintenance of peace, and the propagation and defence of the best forms of civilization. For the performance of these functions there sufficed at that time an executive comparatively small in numbers, directed from the capital by an administration of very little complexity. The local organizations, the subject or allied cities, the vassal states, provided for the rest. The local communities lived their own lives under the protection of Rome, lives which contributed to the general life of the Empire and gave it strength. After a time all this was crushed out, and all that remained was an enormous mass of subjects and an administration which was as highly centralized as it was complicated. The Government became a huge machine of judicature, of administration, and, above all, of oppression,

for the more the system was perfected, the more the central organ, the imperial court, developed, the more complicated became the hierarchy of officials and the greater also grew the cost. The autonomy of former days, the freedom of tenure and of trade, was replaced by various kinds of official organization: the system of colonization which riveted to the rural domains the population of the country districts; the urban corporations within which were confined the greater part of the artizans of the towns; the town councils, in which, in order to ensure the payment of taxation, the State kept its eye upon persons who possessed any considerable means. The result was a sterilization which was alike universal and progressive. Wealth disappeared or was concentrated in the hands of a few, poverty became the normal condition, the population was thinned to a frightful extent. There was no military spirit even among the aristocracy which had long been diverted from the pursuit of arms. The career which was sought after was that in the civil administrations; by an irony of language it was called the "Service" (*militia*). Men "served" in the government offices; the pen replaced the sword. Men "served" also in the Church. These two "Services," the *militia sæculi* and the *militia ecclesiastica* exhausted their ambition. Of the national feeling there remained a certain attachment to Græco-Latin civilization. From the literary circles which cherished this attachment at all times, and in some cases with a pathetic solicitude, this feeling spread among the people and established itself in some degree in their hearts. In more than one province, however, less assimilated than the rest to its conquerors, traditions which dated back before their subjection showed a tendency to revive, like the wild plant which springs up again in fields allowed to go out of cultivation. And besides taxation was so heavy, the State so harsh a master! There were many people who came to think that they were made to pay too dearly for the privilege of not being the subjects of the Barbarians.

In this process of decay Christianity has little or no responsibility[1]: the causes were foreign to it, and for the most part earlier in date. But we must admit that if Christianity had no share in bringing about the downfall of the Empire, on the other hand it equally did nothing to arrest it. The strength

[1] On this question see Boissier, *La fin du paganisme*, ii., 391 ff.

which a State may derive from a national religion firmly established in fervour and observances the Roman Empire could not ask of the Church. Universal in its character even before its birth by virtue of the principles which it inherited from the Judaism of later days, and not only universal but politically indifferent, it could show but little interest in any other city but the City of God, in any other future than that beyond the grave. The only service that it could render to the Empire of this world was in effecting a moral reformation in its subjects. And again we have to remember that the moral teaching of the Church, at any rate in its ideal and in its most complete exemplification, transcended in a marked degree the ordinary needs of the State, and that their respective ordinances were liable to find themselves in conflict.[1] The Church aimed at making saints; it produced many virgins and monks; the "heavenly aspirations" which it implanted in their souls left little place there for the matters which occupy the thoughts of the citizen. It offered consolations to the victims of an extortionate treasury and of all the misdeeds of a bad government; it offered consolations also to the victims of barbarian invasions. But the resignation which it preached and the material relief which it was able to dispense represent no effort to stay the progress of the decline of the Roman State.

At the same time we must make allowance for a lack of consistency in practice. It was very far from being the case that all adherents of the Church were equally devoted to the realization of the ideal system of the Gospels. Long distances separated them from the spiritual enthusiasm of the early Church, from those tiny communities of ancient days which were recruited with jealous care, each member watching over and confirming his brethren, while the hearts of all were directed with eager expectancy to the speedy return of the Christ. Now everyone was Christian, or nearly everyone; and this implied that the profession involved but little sacrifice. At the sacred seasons the baptisteries were thronged literally by crowds; but they were crowds of neophytes hurriedly prepared, with scant instruction in their new religion, and, more serious still, little tested in the practice of the virtues which the Gospels taught. Children

[1] The State had scant need of the monks; its matrimonial legislation allowed of divorce, and the Church had the utmost difficulty in enduring it.

born of Christian parents did not always find at home the religious instruction which they needed, nor even a good example. The Church services did not provide, apart from the catechetical instructions in preparation for the baptism of adults, a well-arranged system of teaching. The Bible was read in them, and was commented upon; the good Christians of that period seem to have been well acquainted with it, for the sermons of the time are full of references to the sacred text, and we find the faithful taking an interest in details of variant readings and of exegesis which would leave the Christians of our own day cold.

But such Christians were a select band, more regular than the rest in their attendance at services, more attracted than the generality by spiritual readings. The mass of the community was Christian in the only way in which the mass could be, superficially and in name; the water of baptism had touched it, but the spirit of the Gospel had not penetrated its heart. Upon their entry into the Church the faithful invariably renounced the pomps of Satan; but neither the theatres nor the games were deserted: it was a subject on which preachers uttered their most eloquent protests, and all to no purpose. The temples it is true were closed; but the places of amusement, even those of the most objectionable character, retained their *clientèle*. Was it really the Church which was overcoming the world? Was it not rather the world which was overcoming the Church?

In the 4th century the Imperial Court, the upper ranks of the various hierarchies of officials, included side by side with Pagans, who were always numerous, a considerable body of Christians. But what Christians! The Emperors themselves left much to be desired in this respect; and below them the prefects, generals, and governors of provinces whom we know to have embraced Christianity, did very little credit to their new religion. For the most part they postponed baptism till their last illness; and in view of this combination of the two, the children of the great families were not baptized. If he had not become a bishop, St Ambrose, no doubt, would only have received the sacrament in the hour of death. His kinsman, Probus, who was a Prætorian Prefect almost without a break,[1]

[1] Ammianus says that when he was not Prefect he had the appearance of a fish out of water (xxvii. 11, 3).

passed from the baptistery to the tomb[1]; the same had been true of the Prefect of Rome, Junius Bassus (359).[2] The garment of innocency which such neophytes carried into Paradise was not—it was very far from being—the emblem of a life without spot and an administration without reproach.

After all, was it possible to give a moral character to the old Roman machine, to subject to the yoke of the Gospel, I do not say the Emperor but the government of the Empire? The Christians who were really worthy of the name do not seem to have thought so: they held aloof from public affairs and refrained even from entering the ranks of the clergy, whom they considered still too much occupied in the things of this world. They lived in retirement, in town or country, engaged in religious meditation and the practice of an ascetic life. In some cases they gathered round them friends or dependents whom they persuaded to live as they did and to form a kind of monastery. Pammachius, Pinianus, Prudentius, Sulpicius Severus, Paulinus, Dalmatius, and many others were men of this way of thinking. Others went further still and fled for refuge to the desert.

We must not, however, suppose that the monks were the only good Christians that there were. Many others were to be found besides in ordinary life, in the avocations and business of the towns, in the domains of the country districts. All did not practise the same degree of devotion. Some of them were constant attendants at the offices of the Church, by day and night. At the time with which we are dealing we find such gatherings becoming increasingly frequent: this is a sign that they were welcomed by the faithful. When at last these grew weary of them, there were formed in connexion with the great churches groups, which soon became guilds, of *habitués* who were called "religious" or "zealous" (*religiosi*, σπουδαῖοι, φιλόπονοι). A man was a *spoudaios* of St Sophia, of the Holy Sepulchre, and so on.[3]

[1] This tomb still exists: it may be seen at St Peter's in the chapel of the Pietà. It came there from a kind of mortuary basilica which belonged to the family of the Probi and was situated at the *chevet* of the great basilica, behind the apse. Cf. *Mélanges de l'Ecole de Rome*, vol. xxii., p. 386.

[2] His tomb is to be seen in the crypt of St Peter's.

[3] As to this see S. Petridès, *Spoudaei et Philopones*, in the *Echos d'Orient*, vol. vii., p. 341; *cf.* vol. iv., p. 225. Cf. *Concilium Toletanum* I., c. 11, 15, 18, and Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum*, 2078, 2079.

Charity to the poor had in no sense grown cold. It was practised in various ways. Patricians who were engaged in ridding themselves of the cares of their wealth had no difficulty in finding the hungry to feed. This was charity in its direct, its most ancient, form—the *Agape*. At Rome the basilica of St Peter witnessed the distribution in this way of enormous quantities of food which was consumed to a large extent immediately and upon the spot. These feedings of the populace were often attended with scenes of disorder of more than one kind. It was inevitable. The leaders did their best to obviate these drawbacks; in particular they sought to divert the bounties of the rich in the direction of organized and specialized institutions, branches from the central organization.

The penitential discipline was still maintained, but the degree of rigour to which it had been carried rendered its application more and more difficult. The sinner who sought and obtained admission to the number of the "Penitents" had to submit to an elaborate system of humiliations and austerities. He had a special place in the church and could only show himself clad in garments of mourning. Fasts of extreme severity were imposed upon him, together with abstention from all conjugal relations, if he were married; if he were not, he was forbidden to contract marriage; if he were a soldier or official, he was compelled to leave the service and return to private life. Never, at any period of his life, could he be admitted to the ranks of the clergy. Practically speaking, he was obliged, without betaking himself to the desert, to retire to his own home and live there the life of a monk.

When these tests had been endured for a fixed time, the duration of which varied according to the judgement of the bishop, the penitent was admitted to a public reconciliation and incorporated once more in the body of the faithful. But woe betide him if he fell into sin again, for penitence was allowed but once. The sinner who relapsed could rely no longer upon the Church, but upon God alone.

Conditions so harsh were calculated to discourage good desires. The reason why so many deferred their definite initiation to the closing hours of their lives was that, inasmuch as they did not feel themselves to possess the strength either to offer a constant resistance to temptation or to endure the penitential discipline to which a fall exposed them, they preferred

to avail themselves of the easy remission involved in baptism. As for those to whom this way had been closed by the solicitude of their parents, it became daily more difficult to induce them to ask for admission as penitents. Deeming no doubt that to render this so difficult was equivalent to refusing it, they turned aside from the absolution of the Church and made their peace with God without intermediary, offering to Him their repentance and such material expiation as was within their power. This was the system of the Novatians; it was even that which the Catholic Church applied to penitents who had relapsed. The great majority contented themselves with it.

Such were the general conditions of Christian morality. As for the religious life it continued and developed upon traditional lines.

The meetings for worship were always, as they had been from the earliest times, two in number—the nocturnal "vigil"[1] and the morning "station," usually concluded by the Eucharistic Liturgy. These meetings varied in frequency in different countries; but in any case they took place everywhere on Sunday. All were bidden to them, but all could not be constant in their attendance.

The ascetics so long as they continued to live among the rest of the faithful were distinguished by the regularity of their presence at meetings for worship. They had even complicated the arrangement of these services by carrying with them to the public churches the prayers which at first they were wont to recite privately or in their oratories. To the Vigil there was added in this way the Office of Matins; other times of the day were consecrated by the Offices of Terce, Sext, Nones, and Vespers. The clergy at first took but a limited share in these; but little by little when the others had grown weary of them, these new Offices came to devolve as a duty upon them, in the same way as the ancient Offices, and devolved upon the clergy alone.

[1] The "vigil," which has fallen into disuse for many centuries is still represented, in the Offices, by the long series of lessons, responds, and prayers which on Holy Saturday and the eve of Pentecost precede the benediction of the baptismal fonts, and on the Saturdays of Ember-seasons form the beginning of the Liturgy. See my *Origines du culte chrétien*, p. 233 (fourth edition).

The singing of Psalms and other Bible canticles, reading of the Old and New Testaments, prayers, sometimes silent—the president confining himself to giving the signal for them and concluding them by a short invocation (collect)—sometimes in a loud voice, the officiant uttering one by one the petitions and the congregation reinforcing them with a word, *Kyrie eleison*, *Te rogamus*, *audi nos* (litany); such was the foundation of the usual religious exercises.[1] To this was added when the Eucharist was celebrated the great prayer of consecration, *Vere dignum*, or Eucharistic Prayer,[2] at the end of which the service of Communion took place. The text of the lessons was often the subject of homiletical comments, more or less frequent and copious, according to the country and also according to the oratorical abilities of the clergy. A Chrysostom or an Augustine was not always at command. At Jerusalem all the priests were accustomed to preach every Sunday, one after the other, a practice which had the disadvantage, to say no more, of greatly prolonging the Offices. At Rome, on the other hand, there were very few sermons.

This represents the ordinary and general order of worship; the ceremonies connected with baptism lent variety to it at certain great festivals—Easter, Whitsuntide, Christmas, and Epiphany; there were also special ceremonies for ordinations, the consecration of Virgins, and the dedication of churches.[3]

The feasts of the martyrs acquired in the 4th century a great popularity. In them is found the beginning of the *cultus* of the saints which became so widespread and so varied in its manifestations. Nothing could be more natural than to pay honour to the memory of the heroes of the Faith. Unfortunately the ardour with which this course was embraced was joined with motives which were open to criticism, and even sources of danger in some aspects. The feasts of the martyrs were accompanied in many places by *agapæ*, which quickly deteriorated into junketings which were a cause of scandal.[4] It needed much eloquence, determination, and even

[1] *Origines du culte chrétien*, c. iv.

[2] This is what is called in Greek the *Anaphora*; it corresponds in the Latin use to the Preface, the *Sanctus*, and the Canon.

[3] In regard to all these points, *cf.* my book *Origines du culte chrétien.*

[4] *Ad calicem venimus* was written on the walls of the cemetery of Priscilla by one of the faithful whose mind was unduly occupied by thoughts of the *agape* and of refreshment.

courage to eradicate these monstrous abuses. Advantage, too, was supposed to be obtainable from securing burial in close proximity to the saints, since they were thought bound to extend at the day of the final resurrection a special protection to their neighbours in the grave. The result of this was seen in an unseemly jostling from which the sacred edifices in some instances suffered.[1]

While waiting for the Last Day the souls of the righteous were regarded as living in the presence of God and forming for Him, in company with the angels, a kind of celestial court. To the mind of the populace whose perceptions in theology were not specially acute, this body of the Blessed, which was also, in virtue of the solidarity of Christians or communion of saints, a body of intercessors, presented some points of resemblance to the ancient Pantheon. I believe that this resemblance is grossly exaggerated when it is asserted that polytheism, which had at first been driven out, returned by this door. Even the least educated of the faithful recognized a difference between God and His saints of quite another kind from that which their fathers had put between Jupiter and his colleagues. At bottom their conception of the celestial court was influenced far less by the Olympus of the poets than by the sight which lay open before their own eyes, that of the earthly kingdom, of the Emperor and his immediate attendants, attendants whose favour availed against the laws, often mitigated their severity and ensured to those to whom it extended the accomplishment of their desires. None the less the distribution of the divine implied in the *cultus* of the Blessed did correspond, in some degree, to a mode of regarding the relations of the Divinity with men which was common enough among the Pagans. A particular saint protected more particularly this or that country, showed himself helpful in particular circumstances, healed this or that disease. Benefit was to be derived from invoking him near his tomb or in a sanctuary which was specially dedicated to him. From this popular theology it was impossible to break free without a determined effort to resist it. The effort was not made, or if made it was speedily discouraged.[2] The general temper among the clergy was bent—how could it be otherwise?

[1] On this point see the *De cura pro mortuis* of St Augustine, and De Rossi, *Bulletino di archeologia cristiana* (1875), p. 21 f.

[2] This was the case of Vigilantius of which we shall hear later.

—upon the conversion of the masses of the people. But these masses who were ushered abruptly into the banqueting hall of the mystic feast brought with them the practices to which they were accustomed, and it was necessary to make the best of these, however repellent they might appear to the instincts of persons of superior education.

To the martyrs of the persecutions were speedily added the saints of the New and even of the Old Testament. Some of their tombs were already known and visited; others disclosed themselves through dreams and other modes of "revelation." In this way were discovered the tomb of Job in Batanea,[1] those of the prophets Habakkuk and Micah at Eleutheropolis,[2] those of the prophets Samuel and Zechariah, of the patriarch Joseph,[3] and above all that of St Stephen, the opening of which in 415 created an enormous sensation throughout the whole of Christendom. Palestine was prolific in discoveries of this kind.

The angels also were beginning to receive religious homage. It was in vain that in the time of Theodosius the Council of Laodicea in Phrygia raised a protest against certain forms of this cult. Its roots in the country were of very ancient date: there was nothing to be done but to accept it. The sanctuary of Chonæ, not far from Laodicea, is one of the oldest of those which have been consecrated to the archangel Michael.[4] With him was soon associated Gabriel, known like him from the Book of Daniel and fulfilling besides an important part in the Gospel. In Syria they were both grouped together with Christ, and the triad thus formed possessed a well-known *siglum* ΧΜΓ. In the same country we find the appearance of the *cultus* of the archangel Raphael, the archangel of the Book of Tobit, and even of the angel Uriel supplied by the Fourth (uncanonical) Book of Esdras. In Egypt they went further still: they celebrated the festivals of the four-and-twenty elders (*vieillards*) of the Apocalypse and of the four symbolical animals—the festivals, that is, of beings whose actual existence was not easy to establish.

[1] *Peregrinatio*, c. 16, in the *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. Geyer (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. xxxix., p. 59).

[2] Sozomen, *H.E.*, vii. 29.

[3] Jerome *adv. Vigilantium*, 5; Sozomen, *H.E.*, ix. 16, 17; Paschal Chronicle, 406, 407, 415.

[4] *Cf.* vol. I., p. 53, note.

The *cultus* of the saints was a sanctuary-cult; it was practised in well-marked places, in most instances near a tomb. Great meetings for service were held there on days set apart for the observance; at ordinary times pilgrims resorted to them and procured the celebration of the Offices, and in particular of the Eucharistic Liturgy (*Oblatio missæ*). The solemn assemblies were occasions for processions and feasts, features which closely resembled the Pagan festivals. This fact excited no alarm in the minds of prudent ecclesiastics; the people, they thought, experienced in this way less disturbance in their traditional customs.

But it was not only to sanctuaries that devotion was directed. Sanctuaries, even those of simple martyrs, were not to be found everywhere; the most venerable shrines were unique in the world. Only at Rome could one venerate the tombs of St Peter and St Paul. In order to visit the Holy Sepulchre or the Grotto of the Nativity it was necessary to undertake the journey to the Holy Land. Piety, ever fertile in expedients, got round this difficulty. Souvenirs were procured, typical relics, phials of oil filled from the lamps of the shrines, bits of stuff cut from the veils which covered the hallowed tombs, fragments detached from the sides of the sacred grottos.[1] We hear also of blood collected on pieces of linen or in sponges at the time of the martyrs' agony; less frequently of bones, of similar origin, I think, for it was only later that people began to open the tombs and to cut in pieces the bodies of the saints for the satisfaction of a piety of which the lack of discretion was more evident than its refinement of feeling.

The cult of images took longer to establish itself; it bore too close a similarity to the cult of idols. The use of painting and of sculpture in the decoration of churches, of cemeteries, and of private houses is a different matter from the veneration which attached later on whether to certain images which were regarded as miraculous or to representations of Christ and of the saints, set up in certain places and in certain ways. This last cult was practised in the 4th

[1] An inscription belonging to the year 359 and found in Mauritania Sitifensis provides us with a list of relics (Audollent, in the *Mélanges de l'École de Rome*, vol. x., p. 441; cf. *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, vol. viii., No. 20,600), which include some of the wood of the Cross, some of "the land of promise where Christ was born," and relics of the Apostles Peter and Paul.

century and in the 5th, but it was not to images of Christ and of the saints that it was addressed but to representations of the Emperors. This was the model which inspired the religious veneration of the sacred images when it found its way into the Church. As for miraculous images, none of those which attained celebrity later seems to go back earlier than the 6th century.[1] At the time with which we are now dealing there were only images used for ornament. Even so they were not favourably regarded by everybody. The Council of Elvira (c. 300 A.D.) had forbidden them in the churches,[2] and not only these but every kind of paintings. St Epiphanius, at the end of the 4th century, adopted the same attitude.[3] But such was not the general feeling. The churches of the period of Constantine at Rome, at Constantinople, and in many other places were plentifully adorned. Certain decorative arrangements were appropriated to the apses; treated on a large scale, they could not fail to attract men's attention, and to convey a message to all. To this class belonged, for example, the Vineyard of the Lord; the Lamb of God placed upon a rock from which gushed out the four rivers of Paradise; Jesus seated in the midst of the Apostles, delivering to St Peter the book of the New Covenant; or, again, Christ in majesty, in the imagery of the Apocalypse, with the four-and-twenty elders and the representations, which certainly possessed but little æsthetic merit, of the four mysterious animals. Along the sides of the naves were reproduced, in panels of mosaic, scenes from the Bible, copied on illuminated manuscripts. The use of these seems to have been of great antiquity.

In the Christian religion the *cultus* of the saints, of relics and of images, is a contribution of the masses. It is in the nature of things that religion should exhibit something of the character of those who practise it. Why should the masses not have set their mark upon it? The thinkers certainly set theirs, and it is a mark of a more perilous kind. They broke free in the earliest days from Rabbinical and Oriental fantasies, but it

[1] On this subject see Dobschütz *Christusbilder* (Leipzig, 1899) in the *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. xviii.

[2] Can. 36: "Placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur."

[3] Jerome, *Ep.* li. 9.

took longer to extricate oneself from Greek philosophy, or rather from the gnostic adaptations of it. Even so complete success was not achieved: the gnosticism of Clement and of Origen, orthodox as it was by comparison, retained for many attractions which did not all proceed from the traditional elements that it had preserved. Side by side with this, and after it, less intrepid spirits set themselves, if not to propose new syntheses, at any rate to explain certain beliefs by the categories of Greek thought. Many of them fell into error and had to be brought back to the Tradition. But between them and their opponents there was some common ground, the scientific explanation of religion, Theology, to call it by its right name. Like the popular form of worship it had roots of some antiquity and sprang from causes which lay deep down. In a greater or less degree the religious man, as soon as he begins to think, endeavours to think religiously; from this point of view theology is coeval with Christian origins, and it finds further in the writings of St John and of St Paul some notable manifestations. For all that, we must not confuse it with religion itself. Religion must not fail to appreciate the services which it has received from theology; but history, while on its side it takes note of these, perceives that the price paid has sometimes been very heavy. In producing the orthodoxy of the Greek councils theology has done its work, of that there is no doubt, but it has done it by successive stages, and in ways which have differed in character; at first by producing heresies, then by assisting to put them down, and finally by systematizing the results of these struggles. Like a famous weapon it has served for the defence of institutions, and sometimes also to attack them.

At the time with which we are dealing, theology found its most usual expression in exegesis. This was its ordinary form, its form on a peace-footing, if I may use the phrase; that which was made use of when there was no heresy in sight. Days of crisis gave birth to polemical treatises; then, when the dust of the conflict began to subside a little, dispassionate workers appeared on the scene who quietly deduced the conclusions and reconciled with the received tradition the decisions which resulted from the recent disputes.

By the development of its worship and of its theology, the Church adapted itself to the feelings, customs, and

prepossessions of the adherents, of very varying degrees of culture, whom it received from all sides. At bottom its teaching underwent no change; based as it was on tradition, it remained firmly attached to it; at the very most it admitted of a few closer definitions as the result of the repudiation of certain theories and the employment of new terms.

Its government, too, in its turn remained essentially the same. The local church is always the private association of ancient times; it continues to possess its property, both real and personal, its organization for relief, and its hierarchy. As in the time of Trajan, this means the supreme director, the bishop; the council of the priests; the body of those engaged in service, the deacons and inferior ministers. But from the very fact of the enormous increase of numbers, how great is the difference in its outward appearance! The tiny groups of the initiated, the few dozens or hundreds of persons who composed the churches of primitive times have been succeeded by multitudes. No longer were meetings held in a garret by the light of a few lamps. The Christian body was now gathered together in basilicas which were spacious, and in some cases magnificent; lustres or colossal candelabra threw floods of light upon the scene. A large body of ministers directed the sacred meetings; deacons maintained order in them; readers in sonorous tones endeavoured to make themselves heard above the noise of the multitude, and to carry even to the back rows the words of the sacred texts. The bishop and his assistant ministers performed the religious acts handed down by tradition, but with rites which had already become intricate, and above all, with imposing ceremonial.

As in other days the bishop and his council decided matters of dispute between the faithful; but the faithful were now so numerous that this judicial system had come to occupy a great deal of time. It was further complicated by the fact that the Emperor threw open the bishop's court to all suitors without distinction of religion,[1] and that suitors as a rule in place of the

[1] This, however, only lasted for a time. The arbitration of the bishop always remained open to suitors, *with the consent of the parties*; but from 398 onwards various imperial ordinances revived the obligation of this agreement, and did so in regard to the court of the Jewish "patriarchs" equally with that of the Christian bishops (*Cod. Theod.* ii. 1, 10; *Cod. Just.* i. 4, 7).

dilatory forms of procedure of the civil tribunals preferred the simple and inexpensive methods of an episcopal hearing.

As in other days, also, the bishop with his body of officials administered the property of the Church. At the outset this meant the management of a small and scantily filled purse; now it included movable property of considerable variety, buildings alike numerous and important, a vast patrimony in country districts with farmers, cultivators, slaves, revenues, and expenses of management. It is extremely surprising when we consider it closely that so enormous an external development should not have produced a greater effect than it did upon the essential lines of the government of the Church. It did have some effect, however, an effect which we must not overlook.

At first the collective body of the faithful showed itself less and less active. When the numbers were very small it was possible for each to have "a voice in the chapter." It is easy to see that in the early days many had a share in the acts of public worship who later on no longer took any but a passive part.[1] It is in the nature of things that this should be so: the larger the numbers, the smaller the direct share in the government taken by individuals. In the 4th century the distinction between laity and clergy has already entered, and to a very marked extent, into established customs. Not only in worship but in the administration of the temporal affairs of the Church it is the clergy alone who count. It was only in elections that the feelings of the people had an opportunity of expressing themselves effectually.

Apart from this the layman had no voice in the Church: his attitude in regard to it is uniformly passive; he is called upon to hear readings and sermons, to associate himself by short ejaculations with the prayers which the clergy frame, to receive from the clergy the sacraments and to recognize the clergy as the depository and the ordainer of them.

The body of the clergy itself had greatly developed.[2] Priests and deacons retained their essential attributes; but,

[1] We need only remind ourselves of the inspired persons, the prophets of early days. At Rome at the beginning of the 3rd century the assembly of the faithful was still consulted to know whether a penitent could be absolved. (*Cf.* vol. I. p. 230 f.)

[2] *Origines du culte chrétien*, c. x.

except in certain places (notably at Rome, where the total of seven was adhered to for the deacons), their number had largely increased. Below the deacons swarmed quite a host of inferior clergy. At first there were the sub-deacons and acolytes who assisted the deacons in the service of the altar: these two grades remained undistinguished in the East, and even in certain Churches in the West. Next followed the exorcists. In the East these do not form part of the clergy properly so-called. In the West they had at first considerable importance, especially in the preparation for baptism. People's minds at that time were greatly concerned in regard to evil spirits, their power and the necessity of delivering from them not only the souls of men but their bodies and nature itself, whether animate or inorganic. Everything over which the name of Jesus Christ had not been vigorously invoked was deemed to be subject to the action of the evil spirit and capable of transmitting it. It was for this reason that exorcisms were multiplied over the candidates for baptism, and that it was insisted that they should descend in complete nudity into the sacred font (*piscine*) without the smallest object, whether ornament, amulet, or binding for the hair, which could afford a lodgement for the enemy. This concern may seem to us strange, but it had formerly too much importance, it has left traces too evident in the liturgy, from ancient times down to our own day, to make it possible for it to be passed over unnoticed. However, since it was especially with the baptism of adults that the part played by the exorcists was connected, in proportion as infant baptism became general the importance of these clergy diminished and also their number. At the council of Arles in 314 almost all the clergy who accompany the bishops are exorcists; in the 6th century they became infrequent; their functions or what remains of them pass to other clerics; we no longer hear of them except in the rituals of ordination.

Side by side with the exorcists came the readers, whose name is a sufficient indication of their duties; then, below these, in the West at any rate, the door-keepers, who do not elsewhere form part of the clergy properly so-called. Last of all come a host of servants, employed especially for the burial of the dead—the guardians of the cemeteries and the churches, *fossores*, *copiatæ*, *parabolani*, etc., bearing different designations

according to the locality. All these formed, in the great towns, a numerous body, salaried and directed by the clergy, and entirely at the disposal of the bishop. To them we must add further the body of officials, the notaries and other employés of the chancery, the managers of the patrimony of the Church, whether urban, suburban or rural, and finally the advocates, legal representatives in the service of the Church.[1] One can understand that, surrounded by such a host, presiding over an administration of such wide extent, and furnished, apart from his spiritual powers, with a judicial authority to which such frequent recourse was had, the bishop in each city and in proportion to the importance of the city was a very great local personage.

He became so or appeared so the more that the town councils (*curiæ municipales*) were falling into an ever-increasing state of disorganization. For many years they had been placed under supervision, and side by side with their elected magistrates, the duumvirs, the State had placed its *Curator*. In the time of Valentinian the common people were provided with a kind of special protector, the *Defensor*,[2] who was taken from outside the *curia*. These magistracies complicated the administration without strengthening it; their powers were gradually absorbed in all important respects in that of the governor of the province, and speedily in that of the local Count. Besides, defenders, curators, and duumvirs were only nominated for a short period; the bishop, on the other hand, for life. The choice of him was therefore no trifling matter; the whole life of the city was interested in the election of the bishop.

Though directed by the neighbouring bishops, this election remained in the hands of the inhabitants of the place, people and clergy. We can well understand that like all elections in all times it did not pass off without schemings and intrigues, without conflicts of interests or of ambitions. Bad choices, if we confine ourselves to established facts, were infrequent enough; but there were many cases of men of mediocre calibre, I do not say in knowledge, for that does not amount to much, but in character and in administrative experience.

[1] "Defensores." *Vide infra*, c. xv.

[2] The institution appeared first in a law of 368 (or a little later) *Cod. Theod.* i. 29, 1. Cf. Em. Chénon, *Étude historique sur le Defensor civitatis* (Paris, 1889).

Theological quarrels made themselves heard in the elections; but the general body of the electors concerned themselves rather with the administration of the ecclesiastical property, and the organization of charitable relief. Towards the end of the 4th century we find feeling running high for or against asceticism. St Martin is acclaimed; for the sake of the austerity of his life Priscillian is excused his disquieting doctrines. Elsewhere men were afraid of persons of severe views and elected easy-going prelates. Generally speaking, however, the populace when it followed its instinct looked with favour upon personal holiness. The worldly prelate, who is, alas, not uncommon, owes his position to other influences. His supporters relied upon him to secure for them freedom from disturbance in a certain laxity of life which was forbidden to earnest Christians by their principles and to common folk by their poverty.

Once installed in his little principality, the bishop was not much disturbed from without. It was not every day that the Government summoned him to great synods or asked for signatures which vexed his peace. As for councils of the region or the province, their use, which had been introduced in various places earlier than the 4th century, had been recommended and even enjoined by the Council of Nicæa. In spite of this, however, they were not held by any means every year and in every province. Even in those distant days the bishops were not very fond of moving from one place to another, especially when the result was to bring them into the society of colleagues who were moved by the very fact of being assembled together to interfere in each other's affairs. Still meetings of bishops did take place; when they were not held in virtue of the canons and at regular intervals, they took place on the occasion of the consecrations of bishops, the dedications of churches, and other solemn functions. In this grouping of bishops the greatest diversities are to be found. In some countries, notably in Asia Minor, the model of the Council of Nicæa was adhered to; the bishops of each province gathered themselves together round their metropolitan. In Egypt, in Africa, and in Italy no account was taken of the place which was the metropolis for administrative purposes: the centre for common meeting was afforded by the mother

church, Alexandria, Carthage, Rome. In the East there were councils which gathered the bishops of Syria round the Bishop of Antioch; the council of Upper Italy meets for business sometimes, under the presidency of the Bishop of Milan. In Gaul we find the designation *episcopi per Gallias et VII. provincias* which corresponds to a strictly defined method of grouping, but one which lacked both a common centre and a recognized head.

In these regionary councils, as in those assemblies which were more or less œcumenical in character, decisions were made upon important matters; in case of need sentences of the first degree were reviewed. Legislation was also enacted, and the canons adopted in such a gathering were often accepted as authoritative at a distance, even beyond the bounds of the jurisdiction in which they originated. At the same time this still fell far short not merely of a systematic codification, but even of authorized collections of canons. These grew up slowly, and in separate centres. Their primary basis was always the group of the twenty canons of Nicæa. At Rome there were speedily added to these the canons of Sardica; at Carthage the African councils; in Asia Minor various councils of the 4th century, those of Ancyra, Neocæsarea, Gangra, Laodicea, and Constantinople.

The authority of the councils rested, in the last resort, on the principle, or rather the feeling, that above the local church there was the Universal Church, above the bishop the episcopate. It is as the representation in greater or smaller numbers of the Universal Episcopate that the council is the superior of the local bishop. The authority of the president, senior bishop or metropolitan, adds nothing or at any rate little to that of the assembly itself. This statement, however, must be understood as holding good in the majority of cases only and as apart from certain traditional positions. Councils which were gathered together in metropolitical cities such as Rome,[1] Alexandria, Antioch, or Edessa derived their authority rather from the metropolis itself, of which all the churches represented were in some sense the suffragans. As the governing body of the episcopate of a region, no council

[1] At Rome councils were held very frequently on the anniversary of the consecration of the Pope (*natale episcopatus*): the bishops attended them by invitation.

presented an authority equal to that which the Bishop of Rome exercised in the Italian peninsula, or the Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt. In those places there were speedily established, and being established there were henceforth maintained, relations of strict subordination and regular government, which attempts were made to imitate elsewhere but with unequal success. When the Alexandrian Pope had spoken it was superfluous to ask the opinion of the bishops of Egypt; with a smaller measure of centralization the authority of the Roman Pope was quite as strong.

We must take into account also the prestige exercised by the imperial towns, Constantinople in the East, Milan in the West. The first, the ecclesiastical origins of which we have already traced, was to become the centre of an enormous patriarchate, which included besides the provinces of Thrace those of Asia and of Pontus, that is to say of the whole of Asia Minor. The second, from the time of St Ambrose onwards, had obtained as its ecclesiastical jurisdiction the whole of the diocese of the North of Italy; it was soon obliged to share this with Aquileia and later with Ravenna. But numerous facts show us that towards the end of the 4th century the Bishop of Milan was considered throughout the whole of the West as an ecclesiastical authority of the first rank. In Gaul, in Spain, in Africa, and in the Danube provinces, when a dispute of importance did not find a solution in the country in which it arose, reference was made simultaneously to Rome and to Milan, to the Apostolic see and to the see of the residence of the Emperor.

Rome, however, did not lose its traditional prestige. At a time when Christianity was undergoing enormous developments, when the number of conversions broke through all established limits and threatened to disorganize the ancient institutions, recourse was had voluntarily and as a natural thing to the wisdom and the long experience of the Apostolic metropolis. Strings of questions came to it from countries of the most diverse character, from Spain, from Gaul, from Dalmatia, even from the East. It was asked about the conditions of admission to baptism, to penitence, to orders, about the reconciliation of heretics, the administration of the sacraments, in a word about all points of discipline and of worship. The Pope was wont to reply; several of these

letters have been preserved; they are what are called the Decretal Letters. In the number and the arrangement of the solutions, they present an appearance analogous to that of the various series of canons which emanated from the councils. Received with the greatest respect by the bishops who had asked for them, they passed from one church to another; when men began, in the West, to form collections of canon law, they found a place in them along with the documents of councils.[1]

Thus at the time when Christianity became the universal religion throughout the Empire and even the religion of the State, the ecclesiastical organization continued on the primitive lines of its development; the local church, very strongly established under the control of the bishop and the clergy; the Universal Church, the recognition of which in feeling is very keen but which it is not very easy to perceive in a concrete embodiment; intermediate between the two, various groupings

[1] Decretals—of Damasus (?); Coustant, *Epp. Rom. Pont.*, p. 685 (*Synodus Romanorum ad Gallos episcopos*; *cf.* E. Babut, *La plus ancienne décrétale*, 1904);—of Siricius: Jaffé, *Reg.* 255, to Himerius of Tarragona, and Roman Council of 386;—of Innocent: Jaffé, 286, to Victricius of Rouen; *ibid.* 293, to Exuperius of Toulouse; *ibid.* 303, to the bishops of Macedonia; *ibid.* 311, to Decentius of Gubbio; *ibid.* 314, to Felix of Nocera;—of Zosimus: *ibid.* 339, to Hesychius of Salona;—of Celestine: *ibid.* 369, to the bishops of the districts of Vienne and Narbonne; *ibid.* 371, to the bishops of Apulia and Calabria;—of Leo: *ibid.* 402, to the Suburbicarian bishops; *ibid.* 410, to the bishops of Mauritania; *ibid.* 411, to Anastasius of Thessalonica; *ibid.* 536, to Nicetas of Aquileia; *ibid.* 544, to Rusticus of Narbonne;—of Hilary: Roman Council of 465; Jaffé, 560, to Ascanius of Tarragona;—of Gelasius: *ibid.* 636, to the bishops of Lucania and Bruttium. A collection of them was early made. In the oldest form in which we can trace it, it included eight documents; first the four decretals of Innocent to Exuperius, Rufus, Decentius, and Victricius; then that of Siricius to Himerius, and that of Zosimus to Hesychius, and lastly the two of Celestine. This collection is met with, in most cases separated into its elements, but always recognizable, in a great number of ancient *libri canonum* belonging to Gaul and Italy. It is this, I think, which is referred to in a letter (Jaffé, 402) of St Leo addressed in 443 to the bishops of his Suburbicarian jurisdiction, in which he threatens them with the severest penalties if they do not observe *omnia decretalia constituta, tam beatae recordationis Innocentii quam omnium decessorum nostrorum, quae de ecclesiasticis ordinibus et canonum promulgata sunt disciplinis.* These threats could not be explained if the ordinances in question had not been published (*promulgata*) outside the places for which they had been written in the first instance.

of churches, the strongest of which proceed from relations of great antiquity, going back to the first preaching of the Gospel, much more than from the provincial apportionment sanctioned at Nicæa. In the days which are now to follow, we shall find the intermediate organizations gaining steadily in definiteness and strength in the Eastern Empire by virtue of some degree of analogy with the civil administration; the bishoprics will be grouped in patriarchates, as the cities were in provinces and the provinces in "dioceses." The State will quite naturally look with favour upon an hierarchical system so arranged as to simplify relations. In the West the barbarians arrived before metropolitical or primatial organizations had been established everywhere. Thus it was not with bodies of bishops that the new-comers had to deal but with isolated ones. And some time must needs elapse before, under the action of the same forces in their little kingdoms as had in the past exercised their influence in the old Empire, we find the episcopate arranging itself there in national churches. But we must not too far outrun the course of events.

Yet this hierarchy, strong as it was, deep-rooted in traditions of the greatest antiquity and supported by its harmony with the State and the State's institutions, had to reckon with a new power which was establishing itself little by little on the confines of the Church: I mean the monks and the monasteries.

It was not without difficulty, as we have already seen, that this new institution had succeeded in obtaining acceptance. Among the sources of the opposition which it evoked there were some which could only do it honour. The monks were hissed in the streets for the Good which they represented, for their earnestness and strictness in interpreting the profession of Christianity. Those who scoffed at them were either pagans or shallow Christians. From another point of view it was not very easy to find a place within the four corners of the Church for people who were seeking to live apart from it, and who by the very fact of their mode of life adopted a somewhat critical attitude in regard to it. So long as the monks remained in the deserts and concerned themselves only with the progress of their individual perfection, it was still possible to manage with them. But they were soon to be seen everywhere and in large numbers, attracting attention by eccentricities of dress and by

an asceticism which was often exaggerated or stamped with ostentation, mingling with the populace and with its religious life, espousing its quarrels and arousing its passions, even and especially when these were excited against the authorities. From time to time they rendered services as the active agents in strong measures or even in disturbance. They assisted in demolishing the temples, in chastising heretics, in making life a burden to officials whose conduct gave ground for complaint. At ordinary times bishops and prefects would gladly have been rid of such restless folk. The institution of monasteries which spread rapidly throughout the Greek Orient and even in the West, from the end of the 4th century onwards, afforded a means of stemming the torrent to some extent. But all the monks were not in the monasteries; there were many of them wandering about the fields and the towns. Besides, the facility with which monastic institutions could be set up led to the establishment of some which were devoid of a serious purpose. The outskirts of the towns became covered with hermitages, veritable dens, which gave shelter to two or three monks, sometimes only to one: in these they lived the life of savages, emaciated, unclean, and in rags. Even in the best regulated monasteries the doors possessed no very effective fastenings; exit as well as entrance was allowed with the greatest ease. For one recluse who remained for forty years without crossing the threshold of his cell, there were hundreds of restless monks who passed from one monastery to another, roaming about through the different provinces of the Empire, and making their appearance in turn at Antioch, at Constantinople, on the highways of Pamphylia or in the deserts of Mesopotamia.

In days of religious excitement all these people were in a state of seething unrest. In the great monastic hives of Egypt, Syria, or Constantinople there was heard a buzzing as of hornets in disturbance. The ringleaders knew where to lay hold of these holy men; they spread amongst them a rumour that the Faith was assailed, that the bishop was teaching false doctrines, that he was making terms with heretics. Public demonstrations were quickly organized; processions marched through the streets of the town; meetings were held in the open air or in the churches; they hurried to make themselves heard at the imperial palace; they demanded justice and raised an outcry that religion was in danger.

With people in this state of frenzy, collected together for disturbance, all discussion was impossible. You must say what they said and grant them what they demanded; otherwise they continued incessantly to groan and to call upon God against His misguided representatives. For they took it for granted that they alone could be right; a mere archbishop counted for nothing; even before œcumenical councils they appeared with disdain in their looks and insolence in their words, listening neither to admonition nor advice.[1]

These excesses were peculiar to the East, where circumstances had given to monasticism a development at once enormous and inordinate. The authorities, alike ecclesiastical and civil, ought to have concerned themselves with it earlier than they did. It was not only by favouring the establishment of monasteries, it was by regulating and disciplining the institution itself that it was possible to succeed in rendering monasticism compatible with good order. It required the serious disturbances which took place in regard to Nestorius and Eutyches to induce the Byzantine government to make up its mind to interfere. At its request the Council of Chalcedon issued a series of regulations on the subject. From that time the power of the bishop could appeal for support to ecclesiastical canons of some degree of definiteness. Monasteries could not be founded without the authorization of the bishop; to the bishop was given the supervision of these institutions; slaves were not to be received in them without the consent of their masters; having once entered monks must no longer go forth, and above all must not go forth in order to meddle with the affairs of the Church or of the State; those who had not their own monastery at Constantinople must be invited or even compelled not to make a stay in the capital. The serving of the monasteries, in the matter of worship and the sacraments, remained entirely under the control of the bishop.

In the West the monasteries were much less numerous and their members limited much more than in the East. The largest number of them was to be found in Gaul. The first impulse was due to St Martin, but subject to that they were influenced by Egyptian and Eastern models. At Marseilles, in the islands of Hyères and Lérins, in the outskirts of Vienne and amid the solitudes of the Jura, places of holy retirement

[1] The analogy with the great strikes of our own day may be noticed.

were soon to be seen growing up, and we find no suggestion made that they gave rise to difficulties. There were certain relations, however, which it was necessary to adjust. The island of Lérins formed part of the diocese of Fréjus, and a conflict arising between the bishop, Theodore, and the abbot whose name was Faustus, as to the extent of their respective prerogatives, a council was held at Arles (c. 455), which laid down rules in regard to the matter. All that concerned the administration of the sacraments and ecclesiastical government was recognized as being within the jurisdiction of the bishop. The rest, viz., the administration of property and the direction of the monks in matters which concerned their life, remained in the hands of their abbot. This solution, which was a very wise one, was based upon the essential character of the monastic community. This community consisted of a group of lay persons who formed, as it were, an artificial family, the existence of which was perpetuated by the addition of new members. The civil law, which is now so suspicious in the matter of such collections of persons, offered no opposition at that time to their organizing themselves, leading their lives and holding property. From the ecclesiastical standpoint there was nothing to hinder the monks, so long as they respected the common obligations of the Christian law, from devoting themselves, as it suited them best, to religious exercises and practices peculiar to themselves. On the other hand the members of the monastery were, like other Christians, members of the local Church; in their Church life they depended upon the bishop.

The Council of Arles had only had to deal with these natural relations; the monks for whom it was making rules were peaceable folk, who had never been found in rebellion, either against the bishops or against the imperial authorities. The men who had had to be dealt with at Chalcedon were of a very different character. There is a corresponding difference of some importance in the two sets of ordinances. The regulations in Gaul recognized for the monasteries a large measure of autonomy; those in the East placed them under the watchful supervision of the bishops. Isaac, Barsumas, Eutyches, Carosus, and other individuals of the same character had somewhat compromised in the general estimation the institutions to which they belonged. It was necessary to put a stop to abuses which were intolerable: the freedom of the

monasteries paid the penalty for the lack of discipline of the monks.

The principles of the Council of Arles were applied almost everywhere in the West, those of the Council of Chalcedon in the East, until the rise of new circumstances necessitated more minute regulations. At Rome the question was slow in presenting itself. That ancient and venerable Church did not easily relinquish the idea that Christian perfection is the duty of all and not the special concern of a few connoisseurs. It contented itself for a long time with "consecrated virgins" and "confessors," whose vow of continency in no way separated them from the general body of the faithful. Monks who lived in isolation were always looked upon in Rome with more or less disfavour, and monasteries were founded there comparatively late.[1] When they did arise, and the earliest belong to a time when the 5th century was already far spent, the authority of the hierarchy took effectual steps to prevent them becoming a source of opposition. There were monasteries at Rome, but they were small ones, usually attached to the churches of the suburbs and even of the city, and there use was made of them for the Offices, under the supervision of the clergy. Thus regulated, they never gave rise to causes of complaint. And further, according to the Roman system, no monk could enter the ranks of the clergy. Nothing could be better calculated to maintain the superiority of the hierarchy.

[1] The *Liber Pontificalis* speaks of monasteries founded by Pope Xystus III., Leo, and Hilary. These are the most ancient of which we have any knowledge at Rome. I am not speaking here of pious companies like that of Marcella.

CHAPTER II

ORIGENISM AND ST JEROME

It was Origen's unhappy fate to furnish in the Church for a protracted period an interim subject for theological disputes. When the great dogmatic crises began to subside and the heresiarchs to disappear, the demon of discord, which was not deprived of occupation thereby, brought up again the question of Origen. At once tempers began to grow warm; sparks flew through the air; designing persons blew upon them with enthusiasm; it was not long before a blaze burst out. We have seen this happen at the end of the 3rd century, immediately following the modalist crisis and the affair of Paul of Samosata. Then came persecution, then Arianism and its long turmoil: men's minds were otherwise engaged. But the times were now to become favourable once more.

After the Councils of 381 and 394 peace was restored in the East. The Arian party was gradually becoming part of the history of the past. The disciples of Apollinarius were beginning to take cover; those of them who remained were busied in depriving their master's works of marks of identification by attributing them to orthodox authors. By this means they kept his heresy in circulation and even procured for it for future days patronage which stood it in good stead; but for the moment, as the name of Apollinarius was no longer heard, no stir was caused. From his island of Cyprus the zealous Epiphanius swept the horizon in vain to discover some new heretic, and to furnish another item for his *Panarion*. It was labour lost! No teacher was now hazarding himself to produce an unpublished counterfeit of the Christian tradition. There was nothing for it but to turn one's attention to Origen and the Origenists.

The term "Origenist" is one upon which it is of the utmost importance to arrive at a clear conception. The great

Alexandrian doctor enjoyed, in cultivated circles, an admiration which was general, but always and everywhere tempered by a measure of reserve. The whole of his system was no longer held by anyone; even his most faithful disciples, Gregory of Nyssa and Didymus the Blind, had been obliged to come to terms with recent dogmatic definitions, and to accept important corrections of statement. At Antioch there was small relish for his transcendental mode of exegesis, in which the reality of the sacred narrative was dissolved. On other points, too, the origin of souls, the final restoration, the resurrection of the body, very serious objections had been raised in one quarter or another. In the acceptance extended to Origen one principle and one only was adopted as a guide: to take whatever in his work was wholesome and useful, and to leave to the author the responsibility for the remainder.

However, as we can well believe, the choice which was made in this way was not likely to be uniform; each decided for himself according to his education and his perception of doctrine. People like Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose or Jerome knew how to profit by Origen without allowing themselves to be led into dangerous courses. Others, less well protected from within, yielded too much to certain attractive features such as the spiritualizing way in which the Alexandrian master explained the origin of souls and the resurrection of the body. This state of mind was not uncommon in the cells of Egypt and Palestine, at any rate in those where the occupants were thinkers. For these holy men the body was so inconsiderable a thing, and they put so much desperate vigour into their warfare with it, that they could not picture to themselves without a feeling of repugnance the immortality to which it was predestined according to the teaching generally received. Origen on this point opened to them views more in accordance with their prepossessions.

Among the representatives of this tendency we may mention the monk Evagrius, one of the celebrities of Nitria.[1] A native of Pontus, he had begun his clerical career under the auspices of Basil and of Gregory of Nazianzus. The latter ordained him deacon and, on his departure from Constantinople, left him with his successor Nectarius. At this moment his virtue was almost overcome in a temptation of guilty passion; he fled in

[1] *Cf.* vol. II. p. 394, note 1.

time and took refuge at Jerusalem. But even there he had to endure terrible struggles, and as a result fell ill. Melania took care of him, heard his story, cured him and sent him to the monks of Nitria. For several years he had lived in the frightful desert of the Cells, when there came there (c. 390) a monk of Galatia, Palladius by name, who enrolled himself in the number of his disciples. Evagrius soon became a master in asceticism; he composed for the benefit of the monks various writings which have been partly preserved. He was a man of great culture. In the school of Basil and of Gregory he could not have learnt to undervalue Origen. Like all those among the solitaries who were acquainted with letters, he read much of him. For all that, in what he himself wrote, there is scarcely any trace to be found of Origenist errors. As for Palladius, he is the author of the *Historica Lausiaca*, the historian of the monks of Egypt, among whom he lived down to the time of the death of Evagrius (January 399). He also, like Evagrius, was acquainted with Rufinus and Melania. All this circle found a common interest in Origen. Jerome, as we have seen, was of the same way of thinking. However we have now come to the time when he was to change his attitude. Hitherto, although he had translated much of Origen and had laid him largely under contribution for his commentaries on the Bible, he does not seem (far from it) to have perceived the heterodoxy of his author. Later, when he had changed his attitude and found himself embarrassed by his early writings, we shall see him protesting strongly that in Origen he had followed the interpreter of the Scriptures, not the dogmatic theologian. That is what at that time he would have wished to have done in the past; but when we read the books to which he refers in this connexion we are not struck by this distinction. Down to the year 392 and his *De viris illustribus* inclusive, the name of Origen is nowhere found in his writings without some laudatory description. He is never criticized: he is often defended, and defended with very considerable spirit.[1]

It was not that Jerome was ignorant of the opposition

[1] For what follows besides the letters and other writings of St Jerome, which are our principal evidence, *cf.* the recent studies of M. Brochet, *S. Jérôme et ses ennemis* (Paris, 1905), and of Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*, Part III. (Berlin, 1908, vol. x. of the *Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche*).

aroused from the end of the 3rd century onwards, and aroused still a hundred years later, by the doctrinal work of his master. He had visited Egypt and knew that the monks of Nitria were not all Origenists. Then also, no doubt, he had got wind of the special horror which was professed in regard to Origen by the disciples of Pacomius, a horror which grew steadily in proportion to the decline in general culture and which was strengthened by the aversion of the Copts for everything which savoured of Hellenism.

But the most serious cause of Jerome's disturbance was the attitude of Epiphanius. The invectives of the *Panarion* were not suffered to lose their warmth. The Bishop of Salamis was always there, always on the war-path, an adversary all the more troublesome because the eminent sanctity of his life won for him universal respect. To Jerome and Paula he was an old friend; they had entertained him in Rome and had visited him in Cyprus. The clergy and the faithful in Rome were also acquainted with him; any words of his which penetrated to them were sure to find respectful hearers. Jerome had for a long time allowed him to talk; but he had no desire to make an enemy of him and used the greatest circumspection in his relations with him. On the other hand, and that was not likely to turn him from a certain reserve, in the monasteries of the Mount of Olives they readily made a great display of Origenism. Certain indications[1] lead us to believe that Evagrius' Nitrian cell communicated with those of Rufinus and of Melania and that letters of Palladius fostered there the feeling of enthusiasm for the master they revered.

Such was the position of affairs when in 393 there arrived at Jerusalem a certain Aterbius[2] who had been sent, no doubt, by the watchful Epiphanius. He went from monastery to monastery, insisting that the inmates should condemn the

[1] It is in this way that I explain the passage in the letter of St Epiphanius to John of Jerusalem (Jerome, *Ep.* li. 9), in which the latter is warned to be on his guard against a certain Palladius, a Galatian, *quia Origenis haeresim praedicat et docet, ne forte aliquos de populo tibi credito ad perversitatem sui inducat erroris.* The author of the Lausiac History was certainly in Egypt when this letter was written. If the point were pressed we might admit that another Palladius, also a Galatian and residing at Jerusalem, was referred to by Epiphanius in this passage. But this doubling is not at all easy to conceive.

[2] Jerome *adv. Ruf.* iii. 33.

dogmas of Origen. Jerome satisfied him; Rufinus showed him the door, and rightly so, I think, for he was under no obligation to render accounts to this self-constituted inquisitor. If any one was in a position to require them from him, it was John, the Bishop of Jerusalem.

John was not a very great teacher, but he was not without literary knowledge. Like his predecessor Cyril, he had lived at first in an ecclesiastical circle which was somewhat suspect, or, to say the least, unfavourably regarded by Athanasius, Epiphanius, and Jerome. But that was a long while before. For the time being there was little reason for finding fault with him. Rufinus and Melania had rendered great services to his Church[1]; he was on the most excellent terms with them. He was not in the habit of railing at Origen on every occasion and succeeded in performing his duties as a preacher without exciting provocative questions on that subject. We do not know how he regarded the mission of Aterbius, which was already an infringement of his episcopal rights; but we may feel sure that the news, which was reported shortly after, of the arrival of Epiphanius in person did not overwhelm him with joy.

Epiphanius landed in Palestine in the spring of the year 394. His monastery of Ad Vetus was still in existence, and in spite of distance he continued to care for it, and even visited it from time to time. But it was not for Ad Vetus that he had left his island of Cyprus this time. The old warrior came with a firmly fixed intention of extinguishing the central fire of Origenism which he believed himself to have discovered at Jerusalem.

He alighted upon Bishop John, who gave him a hearty welcome. Epiphanius was far advanced in years. His virtues, which were already renowned at the time when he was living in his monastery in Palestine, had not ceased during the twenty-seven years of his episcopate to shine with the brightest lustre. The populace regarded him with veneration: they attributed to him many miracles. He had still ten years of life before him, and already he had entered into the domain of legend. Here was a living saint, a man of God. During his stay in Jerusalem the multitudes thronged around him, receiving his discourses with avidity, beseeching his blessing and tearing his robes from him in order to make relics of them. John was somewhat

[1] *Hist. Laus.* 46 (118).

embarrassed with his guest. He thought that Epiphanius' sermons lasted a very long time, and that there was too much in them about Origen and the Origenists. By way of retaliation he himself dealt with the subject of anthropomorphism. This was an old weapon of offence, often employed against the adversaries of the spiritualizing exegesis. They were asserted to be so attached to the letter of the Scripture that they pictured God to themselves in the form of a man with eyes, ears, and all the attributes of humanity. It is unnecessary to say that people so enlightened as Epiphanius did not fall into such absurdities; but it would not have been difficult to find in the lower ranks of the monastic body or of the common people heads which were open to such ideas.[1] Epiphanius was ready to express as much disapproval of anthropomorphism as anyone desired, but he always returned to the subject of Origenism. In exasperation John at length delivered a long discourse, in which he summarily set forth his belief in language conforming as closely as possible to the received teaching. Epiphanius, ill-satisfied with this formal display, could not, in the hearing of the people, do anything but express approval of it. John said only things that were good; but he did not say everything that would have been required to satisfy the old master, and Epiphanius retained inwardly certain suspicions. He departed to Bethlehem to give vent to them before Jerome and his friends.

Jerome up to that time had not put himself forward. Any objections that he might have to Origenism were not of long standing; at any rate he was conscious of only having formulated them a few months earlier. For various reasons, among which must be reckoned the asperities of his character, he was less advanced than Rufinus in the good graces of the Bishop of Jerusalem. But he had not any real ground for breaking with him. He therefore advised Epiphanius to see John again and to endeavour to come to an understanding with him. The old man allowed himself to be half persuaded; he set out again on the road to Jerusalem; but being seized once more on the way by his fury against the Origenists, he went away again the same night to shut himself up in Ad Vetus.

[1] An Egyptian monk to whom someone had succeeded, not without difficulty, in proving that God was not made like a man, protested with grief that they had taken away his God and that he found himself rendered unable to pray (Cassian, *Coll.* x. 3).

Once on his own ground, he passed quickly from dull hostility to open war and set himself to write to various monasteries to rouse them against John and to persuade them to break off all communion with him. Jerome, though seriously annoyed by the turn which the affair was taking, at last made up his mind and ranged himself on the side of Epiphanius. It was a great sacrifice that he was making to his friendship for the Bishop of Salamis. His communities, as a matter of fact, were situated within John's episcopal jurisdiction; he might cause them serious trouble in regard to the sacraments, and this the more easily because neither Jerome nor the priest Vincent who assisted him in the direction of his disciples would consent to depart from the resolution which they had themselves taken not to exercise priestly functions.

In these circumstances there was sometimes tension between the monks of Bethlehem and the intractable saint of Ad Vetus. One day when Jerome had sent him some of his monks for the purpose of giving him explanations, and notably his brother Paulinian, Epiphanius took advantage of the opportunity to carry out a project which he had had in mind for some time: he announced his intention of conferring on Paulinian ordination to the priesthood. In this way Jerome's monasteries would be able to be served without having to trouble about John and his clergy. Paulinian, it is true, had no desire to become a priest, but such a refusal was not likely to stay Epiphanius. He caused the young monk to be seized, and whilst he was held by his arms and legs, and no protest could proceed from his mouth, because it was gagged, he ordained him deacon, and then, with the same procedure, conferred on him the ordination of priests.

Such proceedings might have passed in the times of Samuel and Elijah; in the reign of Theodosius there was some difficulty in securing their acceptance. John uttered vigorous complaints. He threatened to denounce the proceedings of Epiphanius far and wide, forbade the priests of Bethlehem to admit to baptism catechumens presented by Jerome's monks, and even refused to the latter access to the holy places connected with the Nativity.

Epiphanius, somewhat alarmed by the commotion which he had caused, made up his mind to depart, carrying with him to Cyprus "le consacré malgré lui." Before his departure, how-

ever, he wrote to Bishop John a very clumsy letter in which he endeavoured, on extremely poor grounds, to justify the ordination of Paulinian,[1] and under colour of dissuading the bishop from the errors of Origen, does his utmost to compromise him with them. Rufinus, in spite of the fact that Epiphanius had treated him with friendship during his stay at Jerusalem, is singled out in this same document as being specially attached to Origen's heresies. Palladius is also included in its purview. The letter acquired, thanks to Epiphanius' efforts that it should do so, considerable publicity.

John was extremely aggrieved at the whole proceeding. He had been denounced to all persons of religious zeal as a supporter of heresy, and found himself brought into unpleasant difficulties with the Latin colony at Bethlehem. Of the latter he attempted to rid himself by decisive measures. He represented the monks of Bethlehem as schismatics, and obtained an order of expulsion against Jerome from the Prætorian prefect, Rufinus. But an invasion of the Huns which laid waste Cappadocia and the north of Syria, and threatened to extend to Palestine, delayed the execution of the order, and then came the downfall of the powerful minister. As a result, the police left both Jerome and his disciples undisturbed. But such methods of procedure were not calculated to soothe Jerome. The strife between the hermit and the bishopric became more bitter, so did that between the two Latin communities of Bethlehem and the Mount of Olives. Rufinus succeeded in obtaining a copy of the letter of Epiphanius to John which was preserved in Jerome's monastery, and had been enriched by him by a translation in the margin. This discovery made a great stir, and efforts were made to spread the belief that Jerome had not only translated but inspired the letter of Epiphanius.

[1] This saintly man was only too prone to neglect the rights of others when these were opposed to the outbursts of his zeal. While passing in company with John of Jerusalem through a village in the latter's diocese he tore down a piece of embroidered tapestry in the church on the pretext that there was displayed on it an image of Christ or of some saint. Epiphanius shared the views of the Council of Elvira (canon 36), which was hostile to the use of images in churches. It did not occur to his mind that in acting as he did he was offering an insult to the Bishop of Jerusalem. All that he felt that duty demanded of him was to send another piece of tapestry in place of the one that he had torn down (Jerome, *Ep.* 51, c. 9).

To this letter John answered at first only by a contemptuous silence; later he had recourse to Theophilus, the Bishop of Alexandria, who was also appealed to by Rufinus. Theophilus was the friend of both of them; he was not regarded as anti-Origenist—far from it. A man of education himself, he had a strong admiration for the great man, and did not disturb himself too much about his theology. In order to prejudice him against Jerome, they did not fail to inform him of the hospitable reception accorded at the monastery of Bethlehem to an Egyptian bishop who was "persecuted" by his patriarch.

The attempt did not fail of its object. Theophilus sent to Palestine one of his priests, Isidore, a man of standing, who was himself extremely favourably disposed to Origen and was known to be so. He made great efforts to bring back Jerome into communion with his bishop, or at any rate to induce him to say why he had withdrawn from it. Jerome's one repeated answer was that the Faith was at stake; when pressed, he admitted that John had in no way changed since the time when they were on the best of terms; then he sheltered himself behind Epiphanius, who, so he alleged, regarded John as a heretic. The hermit was in the wrong, since before treating his bishop as a heretic he ought to have waited until the bishop had been declared to be so by the competent authority, an authority which was clearly not represented by Epiphanius acting quite alone. In Jerome's attitude in this matter we can see very clearly the tendency which was eminently characteristic of monks of referring oneself in matters of faith and discipline to the judgement of saintly individuals without troubling oneself much about the hierarchy or actual law. Isidore returned to Egypt without having met with success. He carried with him, however, a letter[1] from Bishop John to the Patriarch of Alexandria, in which John described the position of affairs from his own point of view. This document created a stir which spread as far as Rome and was a source

[1] We still possess this, in fragments, in the refutation of it by Jerome, *Contra Johannem Hierosolymitanum*, a pamphlet which it is very difficult to place chronologically and which is, besides, unfinished. It would seem to have been written in 396, shortly after the letter which it combats; but certain passages point to a date about three years later (c. 1., 17, 41). Jerome, if he wrote it in 399, had already been reconciled with the Bishop of Jerusalem. We can imagine that he neither completed nor published a work so likely to give him umbrage.

of anxiety to Jerome's ordinary correspondents. Epiphanius, on his side, wrote to Pope Siricius, but the Pope turned to him a deaf ear. He had been warned previously against Jerome and against Epiphanius himself, who was represented to him by the letters of Theophilus[1] as an upholder of schism and of heresy. Jerome, who had no great support to expect from Rome, ended by yielding to the urgent exhortations of Theophilus and became reconciled to Rufinus. They met one another at the Holy Sepulchre, shook hands, and a Mass was celebrated. This was in 397. In all probability an arrangement dating from that time was arrived at with John, who seems to have authorized Paulinian to exercise his functions in his brother's monastery, and Jerome seems in return to have pledged himself not to harry the bishop any longer on the question of doctrine.

Peace being made, Rufinus set out for Rome. We do not know exactly what brought him back to Italy, after an absence of four-and-twenty years. But, to judge from his proceedings there, it is to be feared that the object of his journey was to rehabilitate in Latin opinion the position of Origen which had been compromised by the recent disputes. Immediately on landing he fell in with a holy man, Macarius, who, as though in the nick of time, was in search of information in regard to Origen and his teaching. Rufinus translated for him the *Apology for Origen*, which had been composed in earlier days by the martyr Pamphilus with the collaboration of Eusebius of Cæsarea. It would have been impossible to conceive a better recommendation. Pamphilus was a martyr of renown; he had written his book in close confinement, while waiting for the hour of his agony; he had dedicated it to the confessors who were shut up in the gaols of Palestine and with the express intention of replying to the criticisms already raised against Origen. Rufinus knew what he was doing in beginning with such a book. He adopted, however, certain personal precautions and added to his preface explanations of his own doctrine, especially in regard to the resurrection of the flesh, adding that such was the doctrine taught by the Bishop of Jerusalem. This doctrine is as orthodox as it is uncharacteristic of Origen.

The first step taken, Rufinus in answer to new and urgent

[1] Palladius, *Dial.* 16.

entreaties from Macarius, determined to take the bull by the horns and to offer to the Roman public the great summary of Origen's teaching, the *Peri Archon*. But he did not translate it exactly as it stood. As an explanation of Origen's very serious errors he had ready to his hand an idea, a mistaken idea but one of which in analogous cases many others before him had availed themselves, viz., that the works of the great Doctor had been retouched by heretics. Acting on this presupposition, he adapted the passages to which objection might be raised in the name of the Council of Nicæa. The passages were not the only ones which were open to criticism. However, Rufinus stayed his hand there, very mistakenly, for as a result he seemed to adopt all that he did not correct.

To crown his imprudence he purported to cover himself with the patronage of Jerome. In his preface he recalls the eulogies addressed to Origen in earlier days by his illustrious friend and the partial translations of him which he had already made. It would have been much to be desired that the *Peri Archon* should have been presented to the Latin public by so well practised a pen; but since more important labours did not allow Jerome leisure for the humble business of translation, Rufinus had thought it in his power to undertake it himself. He proposed, further, to translate Origen in the same way as Jerome had done before him, that is to say with a certain independence in regard to the text, where that should be incorrect from a doctrinal standpoint.

The arrival of Rufinus had not been unattended by some degree of uneasiness in the circle of Jerome's friends. They had followed the polemics in Palestine during the previous years; a certain Eusebius, a native of Cremona, who had lived for a long time at Bethlehem on terms of close intimacy with Jerome, returned to Italy about this time, and his attitude may readily be imagined. The translations of the *Apology* and the *Principia* as the one followed the other created a great stir in such circles as these. Marcella protested loudly. Pammachius, Oceanus, and others of the same way of thinking made a great commotion. But the old Pope Siricius who, thanks to a calm and conciliatory spirit, had seen the end of more than one difficult affair, was not the man to be fired by these quarrels between monks. When Rufinus left him in order to return to Aquileia, the Pope gave him letters for the bishop of that

great town. In spite of all that the friends of Jerome might say, it was his rival who had the upper hand.

Unfortunately for Rufinus, Siricius died at the end of the year 399,[1] and Anastasius, who was appointed as his successor without delay, was not slow in giving evidence of quite different views. He was not a great ecclesiastic. Before Rufinus and his translations, he had never heard either of Origen or of his works.[2] Marcella, Pammachius, and the rest eagerly gathered round him; but it does not seem, for all that, that he was in a great hurry to take a side. However, in the spring of the year 400, he received from Alexandria news which was eminently calculated to stir him to action: Theophilus had declared war upon Origenism.

It was a complete surprise. Theophilus, as we have seen from what has just been said about the quarrels in Palestine, was, in the East, the most notable patron of Origenism, not of course in the sense of embracing Origen's errors but because those errors did not seem to him a sufficient reason for proscribing alike the author and his works. His attitude was almost exactly that of John of Jerusalem and of Rufinus. Epiphanius was a person with whom he felt little sympathy. It was certainly not to please him that he had published, at the beginning of the year 399, a Paschal Letter in which he delivered an uncompromising attack on the anthropomorphites. This document met with a very unfavourable reception in the deserts of Nitria,[3] where anthropomorphites were by no means rare; and the discontent found vent, at Alexandria itself, in a disturbance on the part of the monks in which the archbishop found himself hemmed in closely enough to discover that his campaign would not be supported by public opinion, and that this opinion declared itself with unmistakable clearness against Origen.[4]

It was at this time that there arose his quarrel with the priest Isidore. Till then, Isidore had been the Patriarch's confidential servant, his right hand. Theophilus had taken him from the Nitrian desert to make him the head of the

[1] November 26. As to the year, cf. *Liber Pontificalis*, i., p. ccl.

[2] Origenes autem, cuius in nostram linguam composita derivavit (Rufinus), antea et quis fuerit et in quæ processerit verba nostrum propositum nescit. (Jaffé, 282, Letter to John of Jerusalem.)

[3] Cassian, *Coll.* x. 2.

[4] Socrates, *H. E.* vi. 7.

organization of hospitality and alms (ξενοδόχος) in connexion with his great Church. On various occasions he had entrusted him with delicate missions to Rome, to Constantinople, and to Palestine. In the previous year (398) he had made strenuous exertions to secure his election as Bishop of Constantinople. But in spite of all these relations in the past they fell out. Isidore, the natural protector of the interests of the poor, thought that his bishop wasted money on useless buildings; and on other points too he found himself compelled to oppose him.[1] People did not oppose Theophilus: Isidore was broken in the attempt. He was eighty years old; his asceticism and his aloofness from the world were well known. It was not easy to find a hold upon such a man. Theophilus attacked him in his honour. He set on foot an odious accusation which was never developed but which he used as a pretext for excommunicating his former friend without trial. Isidore retired to Nitria and resumed his life as a solitary. The monks gave him a warm welcome, or at any rate those of them did so who did not tremble at the very name of the Patriarch. Among the number were four brothers, all of great stature, who were known as the Tall Brothers; one of them, Dioscorus, had been compelled by Theophilus to accept the bishopric of Hermopolis Parva, in the jurisdiction of which the deserts of the monks were situated; another was the celebrated Ammonius, who had cut off one of his ears in order to escape the office of bishop[2]; the two others were called Eusebius and Euthymius.

The storm broke upon them also. Theophilus demanded the banishment of those of the monks whom he regarded as responsible for the welcome given to Isidore whom he had proscribed. But these monks were those who were held in the highest esteem for their knowledge, and regarded with the greatest veneration for their moral character.[3] They felt it incumbent upon them to go to Alexandria to talk over the matter with the Patriarch: the only answer they received was insult and brutality. Theophilus so far forgot himself as to box the ears of the venerable Ammonius; he threw his own

[1] Socrates, *H. E.* vi. 9; Palladius, *Dial.* 6.

[2] Vol. II., p. 494. He was the godfather of the minister Rufinus. It is clear that if Rufinus had been still in power, Theophilus would not have dared to touch Ammonius.

[3] Evagrius, who died in 399, escaped these melancholy quarrels.

pallium round his neck as though he intended to strangle him, and cried "Heretic: anathematize Origen then."

It was the first time that Origen appeared in this dispute, the first exhibition of the change which had taken place in the Patriarch's opinions. From that time forward Theophilus had a starting-point for his campaign. He called together a council[1]—it was but a matter of form, for what power had the bishops of Egypt against the will of their Patriarch?—and decreed in this assembly that the works of Origen were definitely pernicious, and that the reading of them should be henceforth proscribed.[2] Then turning against the monks, who had betaken themselves once more to their solitudes, the Patriarch caused three of them, the three brothers of Dioscorus, to be accused by persons devoted to his interests, delated them to the Augustal Prefect, obtained a decree of expulsion against them and took upon himself the execution of the sentence. To effect this he set out for Nitria, accompanied by a few bishops and officials of the Prefect with the addition of the episcopal servants and a large muster of representatives of the rabble of Alexandria. On arriving at its destination, the expedition was swelled by a crowd of monks of more or less anthropomorphite views, who were filled with fanatical hatred of Origen and greedy for an opportunity of taking part in the rout of their opponents. Bishop Dioscorus had collected his flock in the principal church of the valley; his monks held palms in their hands, in order, it would seem, to do honour to the Patriarch. But Theophilus did not so interpret them; to him these leafy branches seemed suspicious; he regarded them as concealing cudgels for unfriendly use. His company assumed a hostile attitude; dreadful shouts were raised, and they rushed into the sacred edifice. Negro slaves dashed to the episcopal chair where Dioscorus was seated, and he was torn from it. Theophilus, having overcome all resistance, held council with his bishops and his monks; the doctrine of Origen was investigated and condemned, with how much freedom of spirit we may imagine in such an assembly and in such circumstances.

[1] In the early months of the year 400, after the sending of the Paschal Letter, which does not seem to have mentioned Origen.

[2] In the same spirit the Paschal Letter of 401 (Jerome, *Ep.* 96) contains a direct attack upon the errors of Origen.

As for the three monks that the expedition had come to arrest, they were not discovered, for they kept themselves concealed at the bottom of a well. Their opponents had to be content with burning their cells and their books. The Patriarch returned to Alexandria, but he made life a burden to his adversaries, and they, regarding the position as untenable, made up their minds to depart of their own accord. Besides the three who had been condemned, hundreds of monks left the Egyptian deserts at this time. The main body made their way towards Palestine. Among them was Isidore, and as he was not lacking in means he provided for their maintenance. Such an exodus was not at all in accordance with the wishes of Theophilus, who had not the least desire to be represented as a persecutor of monks and was not without uneasiness as to the reception which the exiles might receive.

At the outset[1] he had sent word to Pope Anastasius, who without further delay declared himself in opposition to Origen, his books, and his translator. From that quarter the Bishop of Alexandria was free from anxiety. He wrote also to the bishops of Palestine and of the Island of Cyprus a letter[2] of extreme violence against the Nitrian monks and against Origen's doctrine. We still possess the reply of the Episcopate of Palestine, a reply couched in very prudent terms, in which they reprehend categorically those who have wished "to draw from the doctrines of Origen a noxious form of teaching," and at the same time they declare that persons excommunicated by the Bishop of Alexandria will only be received into communion provided they have given satisfaction to him and in this way recover his good-will. The reply was correct in tone, but nothing more.[3] It is quite a different order of enthusiasm which is displayed in the correspondence between Jerome and Epiphanius.[4] The holy man of Cyprus is quite beside himself with joy: "At last Amalek is destroyed, root and branch; on Mt. Rephidim is raised the trophy of the Cross. . . . On the altar of the Church of Alexandria, Theophilus, the servant of God, has raised the standard against Origen."

[1] In the spring of the year 400. [2] Jerome, *Ep.* 92.

[3] Jerome, *Ep.* 93. A letter (*Ep.* 94) of Dionysius, the Bishop of Lydda, an opponent of Origenism of long standing (Jerome, *c. Ioh.* 42), is expressed in different terms from the synodal letter.

[4] *Ibid. Epp.* 86-91.

The most peaceable among the monks remained apparently in Palestine or even returned to Egypt as the result of some arrangement with the terrible archbishop. Some fifty of them who were not satisfied with being left in peace and desired that they should be given justice, embarked for Constantinople.[1] But before we follow them thither we must return to Italy, where the storm was bursting upon Rufinus.

On leaving Rome Rufinus had written to Jerome, who at the same moment had just received the unfortunately-timed preface of the *Peri Archon*. An extraordinary thing happened! The hermit did not take fire at once. He preferred to call to mind the reconciliation which was still quite recent and the promises made at the Anastasis; he replied to Rufinus,[2] not without irony, but on the whole quite amicably, assuring him that he was making people whom he sent to Italy promise not to fail to see his old friend at Aquileia, and his supporters in Rome not to awaken fresh disputes.

But Jerome's friends were little inclined for peace. When the letter to Rufinus reached them, they intercepted it. Pammachius and Oceanus had, no doubt, already written to Bethlehem to draw Jerome's attention to the misuse which was being made of his name, and the danger in which he stood of being regarded as a patron of Origenism. He was exhorted to translate the *Peri Archon* himself in order that light might be thrown on it once for all and people might be able to see whether Origen was orthodox or heretical.

Jerome complied. He immediately sent to his friends a straightforward translation, without any correction. Pammachius was so greatly scandalized by it that he kept it at the bottom of his desk, but not so strictly, however, as to prevent a copy of it being taken. If some doubts might still have been maintained after the version made by Rufinus, Jerome's dissipated them: Origen was undoubtedly heretical.

At the same time as the new translation, Jerome's two friends received a letter[3] from him in which, without naming

[1] It is not certain, in spite of what is said about it by Socrates (vi. 9) and Sozomen (viii. 13), that Isidore and Dioscorus made the journey with the others. In a letter to Epiphanius, written at the end of 401 or the beginning of 402 (Jerome, *Ep.* 90), Theophilus only mentions among the leaders of the monks who made their way to Constantinople, Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius. Isidore died in 403 (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* i.).

[2] *Ep.* 81. [3] *Ep.* 84.

Rufinus, he adopted a defensive attitude, and one characterized by singular asperity. "Why should people claim his patronage? Could they not be heretics without him? No doubt he had praised Origen, but the admiration which he had always professed for Origen's ability had never closed his eyes to Origen's errors. It is alleged that these errors are interpolations of designing persons. Let them believe it if they can. Origen had fallen absolutely and unquestionably into the heresies contained in his books. It was useless to seek to cover him under the patronage of Pamphilus: the *Apology* was not the martyr's, it was the work of Eusebius of Cæsarea."

At the time when he entered the lists Jerome was still in ignorance of the changes of front which were in course of execution in high places, equally at Rome and at Alexandria. Theophilus had not shown more energy in "raising the standard" than Pope Anastasius, whom he had warned,[1] in taking formal action of his own. At the request of Eusebius of Cremona, Origen was expressly condemned and his books proscribed; a notification[2] of the sentence was despatched to Simplicianus, the Bishop of Milan; subsequently, as he died shortly afterwards,[3] his successor, Venerius, received another letter to the same effect[4]; and finally steps were taken to obtain from the imperial authority a decree of official proscription. These steps were successful: the writings of Origen were officially prohibited, in the same way as the works of Porphyry and of Arius.

Origen was not the only person concerned. Jerome's friends demanded also the condemnation of Rufinus, towards whom the new Pope was evidently exceedingly ill-disposed. But Rufinus was not easy to attack. Apart from the friends, also numerous, that he possessed in Rome and whom he owed in part to his relations with Melania, he was known to be closely allied with the saintly persons of Nola, Paulinus, and Theresa, who though treated with some coldness by Pope Siricius, were now in high favour with his successor. Chromatius, the venerable Bishop of Aquileia, had given an exceedingly warm welcome to his fellow-countryman. Not

[1] Jaffé, 276; *cf.* Jerome, *Ep.* 88.

[2] Jerome, *Ep.* 95; Jaffé, 276. [3] August 15, 400.

[4] Jaffé, 281; cf. *Add. et corr.* vol. ii., p. 691. The best edition is that of P. van den Gheyn in the *Revue d'hist. et de litt. relig.*, vol. iv., p. 5.

that he was not on good terms with Jerome: he never ceased to inculcate peace. Finally Bishop John of Jerusalem did not forget his friends on the Mount of Olives[1]; under guise of consulting Anastasius on the case of Rufinus, he endeavoured to set him on his guard against the counsels of fanatics.

We have no evidence that Anastasius took steps against Rufinus. The latter, however, thought that he ought to do something to appease the anger which had been excited against him: he addressed to the Pope[2] a confession of faith of a highly satisfactory character. This document does not seem, it is true, to have made any sensible change in the attitude of its recipient, but no doubt it contributed to hinder him from pushing matters further, and created a good impression in the ecclesiastical world. We do not know whether Anastasius made any reply to this *Apology* of Rufinus; he refrained from mentioning it in his reply to John of Jerusalem[3]: "Origen," he says, "is a pernicious author; if Rufinus has translated him to make people detest his errors, he has done well; if to recommend him, he has done ill. All depends upon the intention, a matter of which God alone is the Judge. For the person of Rufinus the Pope has no responsibility; he does not wish to know either where he is or what he is doing."

It would be difficult to show less kindliness of tone. Rufinus might make up his mind to say good-bye to any pontifical favour. It only remained to him for the future to address himself to public opinion. He did so without delay. I have already said that Jerome's friends had had the stupidity to suppress the letter in comparatively pacific terms which he had sent to them for his old friend. The result was that the shrewd thrusts of the letter to Pammachius and Oceanus stood alone and without modification as expressing his feelings in regard to Rufinus. Rufinus now took up his pen: in his *Apology*, which is divided into two books, he sets out in the first place his defence against Jerome's imputations, and then takes his opponent to task for his attitude in the matter of Origen, for his translation of the Bible, and for his devotion to

[1] Melania, in all probability, was still at Jerusalem.

[2] Migne, *P. L.*, vol. xxi., p. 623.

[3] Migne, *P. L.*, vol. xxi., p. 627. Another letter, which is now lost, was addressed to the East after this one (Jerome *adv. Ruf.* iii. 21, 38).

pagan literature. He discharges the whole of the load which lay upon his breast with a bitterness which is not justified by the tone of Jerome's letter to Pammachius, but which is explicable when we take into account the unbridled attack of which the writer had been the object since his return to Italy.

The book, addressed to Apronianus, one of his friends at Rome, was not (so it was said) intended for publicity; but Jerome's supporters, always anxious to stir up the fire, procured extracts from it and sent them to Bethlehem. Incapable of self-restraint, Jerome would not wait for the complete text of the *Apology*, but set himself to refute it on the basis of the extracts at his command. His reply, couched in a style at least as spiteful as that of Rufinus' pamphlet, drew upon him a reply from the latter.[1] Jerome made a further reply, always with the same asperity. Rufinus, in his last writing, had threatened, if he did not keep silence, to disclose certain misdoings which Jerome had confided to him in former days. To this Jerome replies that Rufinus is asking for his head, without reflecting that by this exaggeration he is giving people reason to think that he had actually confided to his friend some very terrible secrets.

This insane polemic filled all well-disposed people with misery. Augustine, who was reached by its echoes even at Hippo, was greatly distressed.[2] The good Bishop Chromatius used all his efforts to secure silence; but it was not easy. At the end of his reply, Rufinus said to Jerome: "I hope you love peace," to which Jerome retorted: "If you care for peace, begin by laying aside your arms."

That is what Rufinus did, and we must give him credit for it; for in matters of this sort the first who holds his tongue is the better advised. During the ten years of life which remained to him he seems to have forgotten the existence of his formidable adversary. At the request of Chromatius and his other friends he continued his translations. It was at this period that he turned into Latin the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius, the Clementine *Recognitions*, the dialogue Adamantius, the history of the monks of Egypt (journey of

[1] Now lost, but capable of being reconstructed from Jerome's third book.
[2] Aug., *Ep.* lxxiii.

394),[1] a number of homilies of Basil, of Gregory of Nazianzus, and of Origen, some "Sententiae" of Evagrius, and even the maxims of Sextus the Pythagorean, which circulated under the name of the Martyr Pope Xystus II.[2] For him the evil days were over. At the end of the year 401 (December 19) Pope Anastasius died; and his successor, Innocent, does not seem to have espoused to the same extent as he had done the personal animosities of Jerome.[3]

Besides, Jerome, in his fury against the Origenists, was on the point of adopting in the East an incredible attitude which was in any case little calculated to win for him Innocent's good graces. Thus Rufinus was enabled to pursue his literary labours undisturbed, to maintain his relations with his numerous pious and distinguished friends, and to pay no heed to the distant rumblings, the echo of which reached him from Bethlehem.

For Jerome on his part abated no whit of his anger. Melania was to him an object of horror. He erased from his *Chronicle* the eulogies which he had lavished upon her twenty years earlier: "The very name of this woman," he said,[4] "bears witness to the blackness of her soul." As for Rufinus he could no longer speak of him without abusing him, referring to him by nicknames, and calling him the Scorpion, the Pig (Grunnius[5]). Rufinus died in Sicily, in the year of the fall of Rome (410). Here would have been an opportunity for applying the rule: *Jam parce sepulto*; but Jerome uttered a shout of rejoicing: "See the scorpion lies hid beneath the

[1] Vol. II., p. 402, *note*.

[2] St Jerome makes much fun of Rufinus (*Ep.* 133, 8; *Comm. in Jerem.* xxii. 24; *in Ezech.* xviii. 5) in regard to this confusion into which St Augustine has also fallen (*De natura et gratia*, 64; but cf. *Retract*, ii. 42). However the matter is not so clear as he thought it. *Cf.* Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchristl. Litteratur*, p. 765; *Chronol.* ii. p. 190; Martin Schanz, *Gesch. d. römischen Litteratur*, § 339. The Sentences of Xystus, in the form in which Rufinus translated them, represent a Christian adaptation of a Pythagorean book; Origen had already before him the same text as Rufinus.

[3] Jerome never speaks of Anastasius save in language of extravagant eulogy. He goes so far as to say (*Ep.* 127, 10), that if he died so soon it was that Rome might not be taken (410) under such a bishop. It was a curious compliment to his successor.

[4] *Ep.* 132, 3. Melania, in Greek, means "black."

[5] The verb *grunnire* expresses the grunting of the pig.

soil of Trinacria; at last the hundred-headed hydra ceases to hiss against me." In point of fact the hydra of whom he complained had long ago ceased to trouble him. It was only Jerome himself who hissed, and he did so as long as he had the strength.

It was a melancholy quarrel! Jerome, at some moments, seemed tempted to lament it: "What an edification for the public to see two old men trying to kill each other on a question of heretics, and professing each of them at the same time to be Catholics." It was a good impulse, which he immediately repressed. Both of them were in the wrong. Rufinus was unwilling to see what is clear as daylight, that the theology of Origen is incompatible with the teaching of the Church; that to spread it and make much of it was the surest way to provoke its condemnation and to draw suspicion upon himself, despite the fairest-seeming professions of faith. On this point Jerome had the advantage. But he himself had an Origenist past; he had had to sing a Palinode and did not like it to be mentioned. Rufinus, and this was a second false step, felt called upon to irritate him on the subject; taking advantage of Jerome's former writings he represented him as a patron of Origen. Jerome defended himself too thoroughly. It would have been easy for him to make his position quite secure, and to protest in a few words against the part which it was designed to make him play. But with the impulsiveness of his character and the power of his *verve* the old rhetor was not the man to let slip an opportunity for invective. Let us admit in his excuse that his friends in Rome, who ought to have calmed him, used their whole efforts to spur him on. But the most regrettable feature in the matter is that he should have cherished a grudge for so long, and that even on the death of his opponent he should not have quenched his anger.

Jerome was a monk apart. In his retreat at Bethlehem he thought too much of the public at Rome, and of the opinion which was held there in regard to himself. It was for this world that he was wont to write, whereas other monks for the most part wrote only for readers in the desert. But we must not pursue this train of thought too far: if Jerome had done as they did, not only Latin literature but the Church itself would have sustained too heavy a loss. In the honours with

which it surrounds his memory the Church signalizes with great care his translation of the Scriptures and his works of exegesis.[1] And it does so with justice; to the author of the Latin Bible one may well forgive a few intemperate expressions.

[1] Deus, qui Ecclesiae tuae in exponendis sacris Scripturis beatum Hieronymum, confessorem tuum, doctorem maximum providere dignatus es . . . (Prayer for the Feast of St Jerome, September 30.)

CHAPTER III

CHRYSOSTOM AND THEOPHILUS

THEODOSIUS died too soon. He left three children, two sons of his first marriage with Flaccilla—Arcadius and Honorius—and by his second wife, Galla, the sister of Valentinian II., a daughter Placidia (*Galla Placidia*). This daughter who was reserved for so strange a destiny was still only a child. The Empire was divided between her two brothers, Arcadius receiving the East and Honorius the West. The first was scarcely eighteen, the other eleven. Their age placed them under wardship, as did, even more inevitably, their dispositions; both of them attained what is called the age of manhood, but they scarcely emerged from childhood.

The guardians were already in control, Rufinus at Constantinople, Stilicho at Milan. As they regarded each other with hearty detestation, a conflict was easily to be foreseen. Stilicho was the stronger: he was a warrior, one of the best of Theodosius' generals; the Emperor esteemed him highly and had given him in marriage his niece Serena.

From his last communications with the dead sovereign Stilicho inferred a sort of general mandate to himself to watch over the whole Empire and the whole of the imperial family. So far as the West was concerned he had his hands free: Honorius did not count. The army of the East had followed Theodosius to Italy; it was still there, and Rufinus in consequence had no troops under his orders. His depredations and his cruelties had created for him innumerable enemies; the most formidable, the Great Chamberlain (*præpositus sacri cubiculi*), Eutropius, lost no time in dealing him a home-thrust by thwarting the plan which he had made of marrying his daughter to the young emperor. Eutropius forestalled him and made Arcadius marry a young girl of Frankish birth, Eudoxia, the orphan child of the Consul Bauto, who had been brought up in the

household of the late general Promotus, one of the enemies of Rufinus. The marriage took place on April 27, 395, to the great mortification of the Prætorian Prefect.

However, the barbarians began to become a menace. Alaric, the leader of the Goths whom Theodosius had brought to Italy as auxiliaries, being sent by Stilicho back to the Illyrian provinces laid those districts under pillage. Stilicho interfered, but ineffectively, with the result that Arcadius called on him to surrender his command. He obeyed, but came to an understanding with the general Gainas, another Gothic chief, who was to lead these troops to Constantinople. Their first step on their arrival there was to seize the person of Rufinus and put him to death (November 26, 395). Arcadius completed the downfall by confiscating his minister's property.

The guardianship passed into the hands of Eutropius who exercised it for nearly four years. Though less cruel than Rufinus, he showed himself quite as greedy, and thought only of enriching himself by extortions, while the Eastern Empire was submerged by barbarians. Among these were the Huns who, forcing the Caucasus and the Danube, were spreading over Thrace, Cappadocia, and Syria, and threatening to advance as far as Palestine.[1] Others were the Goths who had settled in Asia Minor and now rose under their commander Trebigild. They were engaged in ravaging Phrygia and the neighbouring provinces, winning over to their side the troops, themselves barbarians, which were sent to oppose them; and thanks to the complicity of the commander-in-chief, their countryman Gainas, were holding their ground in spite of anything that could be done against them and were making ready to cross the straits. Eutropius, eunuch though he was, had led an expedition against the Huns and had compelled them to recross the Caucasus, a service for which he was rewarded by being nominated Consul and Patrician. The revolt of the Goths cost him not only his place and his fortune but his life. Gainas in concert with Stilicho demanded the disgrace of the favourite as the only means of pacifying the insurgents. Arcadius hesitated: the Empress insisted. It is true that it was to Eutropius that she owed her crown; but she had begun to find him too powerful. The altar of St Sophia protected the fallen

[1] See above, p. 34.

minister for a short time; he was even able to leave this place of sanctuary, but he was overtaken again shortly afterwards and executed (399).

Gainas threw aside the mask, united his troops with those of Trebigild and marched on Chalcedon. Some high dignitaries to whom he owed a special grudge—the consul Aurelian and Saturninus, the consul-designate—were perforce surrendered to him. The Emperor was compelled to cross the sea, to go to St Euphemia and give pledges to the barbarian; and then what remained of the Roman troops having been sent away from the capital, the Goths established themselves in Constantinople. They gained no good by it, for after a very short time a kind of unreasoning terror impelled them to flight. Gainas, who was the first to leave, was able to withdraw into Thrace with a small company; the rest were massacred by the populace. In the neighbourhood of the Danube Gainas fell in with the Huns who slew him and his band (400). The court of the East could breathe freely. The barbarians were annihilated, at any rate those with whom Constantinople had to do for the time being; it was in Italy that Alaric was giving ground for anxiety. Gainas was, in short, the Alaric of Constantinople, but a good Alaric who caused more fear than harm.

On this troubled scene there stands out from the rest the figure of the Archbishop John.[1] It was in 398 that he had been summoned from Antioch, through the instrumentality of the Court, where the influence of Eutropius was still dominant. The death of Nectarius had thrown open the field to rival candidates. Besides local ones, who were not wanting, the

[1] For the history of the events which follow the principal authority is the Dialogue of Palladius with the Roman deacon Theodore. The dialogue is clearly fictitious and purports to have been held about the year 408. This Palladius is, in my opinion, the same person as the author of the *Historia Lausiaca*, Palladius, Bishop of Helenopolis (*cf.* the reasons adduced by Dom. E. C. Butler, *Authorship of the Dialogus de Vita Chrysostomi* in the volume published by the Committee for the Fifteenth Centenary of St John Chrysostom); he is a witness, but a partisan who has been exasperated by exile and the ill-treatment which his fidelity to Chrysostom cost him. Socrates and Sozomen (*cf.* also Philostorgius and Zosimus) have preserved to us reminiscences which are local but occasionally perverted by the confusion produced through too long a course of oral tradition. It is the same, with greater reason, with Theodoret. Certain discourses of Chrysostom connect themselves closely with events. As to his correspondence it concerns chiefly the period of his exile.

candidature of Isidore,[1] a celebrated priest of Alexandria, was of special importance. He was pushed with much energy by his Patriarch, Theophilus, who had no lack of means of influence, both good and bad, and little scruple in employing them all. But Isidore was a man of eighty and Theophilus caused uneasiness by his daring. Eutropius set aside the Alexandrian candidate and cast his eyes upon the ecclesiastical orator whose name was spoken of throughout the East. John was brought to Constantinople, presented to the suffrages of the local clergy and faithful laity, and then consecrated by the bishops. The Court required Theophilus to preside at the ceremony; and he did so, much against his will.

Constantinople had as its bishop a man of great eloquence: that was why he had been chosen; but he was also a saint, and one of those unyielding saints in whose eyes principles are made to be put in practice. There was at once a crowd around his episcopal chair, and an enthusiastic crowd; but away from it there was soon heard a general chorus of recriminations. The abuses which he lashed and cut down without mercy found spokesmen to protest against his severity. Under the aged and peace-loving Nectarius discipline had fallen into a deep slumber at Constantinople. We may suppose that the same was the case at Antioch, where the pastoral staff was in the tired hands of the venerable Flavian. But at Antioch John was not the master: the responsibility was not his, and so he had not shown his measure. Now his hands were free. His flock saw him first of all setting the bishop's house in order, and removing from it everything that savoured of luxury. Nectarius was in the habit of receiving freely the notabilities of the city and the Court; John received no one and ate always alone. The clergy had not troubled themselves about the regulation of morals, or at any rate with the precautions which safeguard it; John required that the "spiritual sisters" should be dismissed. The clergy of all ranks and the canonical "widows" (deaconesses) were urged to live frugally and not to frequent the tables of the wealthy. Upon the monks who drifted unceasingly through the city he imposed retirement in their cells and monasteries. Being always keenly interested in the care of the poor, he caused charitable institutions to profit by the economies which his reforms introduced into the administra-

[1] See above, pp. 35, 39, *et seq.*

tion of the Church. But it was not only the clergy that he took to task. As at Antioch, he waged war upon the over-weening ostentation of the rich, the shows of the hippodrome, and the vices of the Court. His hearers applauded him enthusiastically. His eloquence, the animation of which differed greatly from the official addresses and panegyrics, touched men's hearts to the quick. Mid the silence of the great city in thraldom his voice and his alone, made itself heard; and always it pleaded for the weak against the oppressor, for the poor against the rich, for virtue against over-weening vice. John struck without sparing, caring no more for the dull anger which his eloquence stirred up than he did for the resistance provoked by his reforms. These resisting forces he broke in pieces without pity. At his side worked his archdeacon, Serapion, an Egyptian dour and stern, a determined advocate of deprivation and other extreme measures. Few months had elapsed since John's advent, and already a party of opposition was being formed.

But for a man of John's character opposition means struggle, and struggle is the normal state, the necessary relation between evil and good.

There were still many Arians at Constantinople. In accordance with the Theodosian legislation their churches were situated outside the walls; within the town they were allowed to live, but not to perform their worship. To compensate themselves they had adopted the plan of going out to their churches in the suburbs in procession; they were accustomed to meet under certain colonnades, and before their departure, which took place at early dawn, to spend part of the night in going through the Vigil office in the open air. Their chants drew people together to them; John was alarmed by this and organized a rival service. Orthodox processions and Vigils soon disputed the hours of night and the streets with the followers of the Council of Ariminum. From this conflict of psalmody it was a short step to objurgations and then to blows, with the result that the Arian Vigils were at last prohibited. A great strength of the surviving Arians lay in the fact that they were the co-religionists of the Goths, who were so powerful in the army. But the Goths were not all Arians; there were Catholics[1] among them. John gave them a church

[1] Vol. II., p. 450.

with priests belonging to their nation, who officiated in the Gothic language. He readily took part in their religious services, and even preached there through the medium of an interpreter. Upon this mission, and also upon the Gothic churches in the Crimea,[1] he built certain hopes. During the occupation of the town by Gainas he had hard work to prevent the barbarian seizing one of his churches; but he succeeded. Gainas entertained a great respect for him; it was at his entreaty that he had spared, a few days before, the lives of Aurelian and Saturninus.

The Court was at first quite favourable to the Archbishop. Since the death of Eutropius, between whom and his punishment the eloquence of Chrysostom had for a moment stood, influence had passed into the hands of Eudoxia: her piety, which she manifested on occasion, did not hinder her from listening to the protests excited by John's zeal. Priests and deacons, deprived without mercy, were endeavouring to stir up a revolt of the clergy, and the monks were hostile. The most prominent among them was a Syrian named Isaac, who was credited with having prophesied in 378 the disaster of Valens.[2] He had founded a monastery, the first orthodox monastery which had been seen at Constantinople. As Isaac was a man of great popularity, his attitude was not without serious importance.[3] Nearer the person of the Empress, agitation was fomented by certain great ladies who had their own reasons for finding scanty relish in the Archbishop's homilies. Prominent in this circle were Marsa, the widow of Promotus, Castricia, the widow of the Consul Saturninus, and Eugraphia, who showed herself specially active. Lastly, some of the bishops whose business called them to Constantinople, allowed themselves to be captured by the coteries of the opposition. Three Syrian prelates are especially mentioned—Antiochus of Ptolemais, a polished speaker, Severian of Gabala who also was a fluent preacher, though he spoke with the accent of his country, and finally Acacius of Beroea, whose conduct was not always in keeping with his grey hairs. These prelates, who were in favour at Court, were accustomed to spend more

[1] Vol. II., p. 450, note 2. [2] *Ibid.* p. 332, note 2.

[3] In regard to this individual see the observations of Père Pargoire in the *Echos d'Orient*, vol. ii., p. 138 *et seq.*; cf. *Revue des quest. hist.*, vol. lxv. (1893), p. 120.

time in the capital than was reasonably necessary. John would have preferred that they should have been in their Syrian dioceses, and between himself and them disputes arose from time to time. On one occasion Acacius, dissatisfied as it seemed with John's hospitality, let fall a remark which was at once sinister and wanting in respect: "I am going," he said, "to prepare for him a dish of my own." He kept his word.

An incident occurred which still further increased the number of the saint's enemies. Antoninus, the Bishop of Ephesus, was accused before John by one of his suffragans. According to the second canon of the Council of 381 this matter fell rather within the jurisdiction of the bishops of the "Diocese" of Asia. The importance of the see, the urgency with which the charge was pressed, and the gravity of the circumstances determined the Archbishop to receive the plaint. While the matter was in course of examination Antoninus died,[1] and a number of clergy belonging to Ephesus and other places entreated John to come in person in order to re-establish order in these churches which were the scene of many abuses, the principal one being simony.[2] John actually went, and spent the early months of 401 at Ephesus. The guilty prelates were deposed and successors were appointed, various things were set in order, and then the Archbishop returned to the capital, leaving behind him a feeling of hostility in more than one quarter.

It was shortly after this, towards the end of the same year (401), that there arrived in Constantinople the Nitrian monks who had been persecuted by Theophilus on the pretext of their Origenist views. Thus the enemies, already numerous, influential, and active, who were bestirring themselves against John, were joined by another, a foe of a very formidable kind both on account of the variety of his resources and his lack of scruple. The struggle began to promise to be interesting.

We have already seen a conflict between the Bishop of the

[1] He does not seem to have refused to recognize the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Constantinople.

[2] The rich, in spite of legislation to the contrary, were wont to seek to enter the ranks of the clergy in order to escape from the duties of the *curia*. To attain this end they had no hesitation in incurring expense, and, in one way or another, succeeded in purchasing ordination.

great metropolis of Egypt and the Bishop of the capital, and that long before the Church of Constantinople was of serious importance. At the time when the seat of government was still at Nicomedia, Eusebius, the bishop of that town, had conducted a somewhat bitter controversy with his colleagues of Alexandria, Alexander and Athanasius. During the sojourn of the Court at Antioch, this struggle was continued by the Arian holders of that great see. The Bishop of Antioch supported the Anti-Popes of Alexandria, Pistus, Gregory, George, and Lucius; the Bishop of Alexandria extended his patronage to the "Little Church" of Antioch. From the days of Theodosius onwards the political importance of Antioch was transferred definitely and decisively to the New Rome, and as every one had come over to the orthodoxy of Nicæa, peace seemed assured. But in these quarrels on the subject of dogma, men had become accustomed to assuming an attitude of hostility. When arms were laid aside they were placed in the rack and thus served to awaken only too frequent recollections of the use which had been made of them.

Alexandria had long proved a doughty opponent. Athanasius had laid up for it a large store of respect in the eyes of the world. And from another point of view the physical conditions of the country and its traditions of extreme centralization in secular affairs had made their influence felt even in the domain of ecclesiastical policy. This country must always have a Pharaoh, a head who was absolute in authority and invested with a sacred character, who took everything under his charge and was responsible for everything. In the sphere of religion this chief existed: he was the Bishop of Alexandria, the absolute master of his body of bishops, which as a body took its origin, without exception, from him and governed itself invariably in accordance with his orders. When we speak of Councils in Egypt, we must not think that the word bears the same meaning there as it did elsewhere, that is, that we have to do with an assembly deliberating unfettered under a formally appointed president. In the Egyptian Councils whether there were more or fewer bishops was a matter which made absolutely no difference. One voice only counted, that of the chief, the Pope as he was called; the others only made themselves heard to approve what he said. The sole power

beside that of the ecclesiastical Pharaoh[1] was the power of the monks. Since the time of Athanasius it had been kept in hand. The conflicts of Theophilus with the solitaries of Nitria, passing conflicts as they were, taught the Patriarch that in the monastic world it was not the best educated, the intellectuals as we should say nowadays, who could offer an effective resistance. The important thing was to come to an understanding with the democracy of the cells, and to know how to guide that. In 400 Theophilus had taken his side: he now felt the whole of Egypt behind him, the whole of the influence of the clergy, and all the enthusiasm of the monks.

When contrasted with such a power the civil authority, at any rate on the spot, presented a much less distinguished appearance. From the time of Diocletian, who did not like Alexandria, the country had been divided into several provinces and attached, so far as concerned its higher administration, to the "Diocese of the Orient," which was governed from Antioch by the high official who bore the title of *Comes Orientis*. Thus Egypt, regarded as a whole, had no administrative expression. There were provinces in Egypt; there was no longer, from a civil point of view, a Province of Egypt; still less was there a "Diocese" of Egypt. This state of things changed under Valens; in 368 we find the appearance of the "Augustal Prefect" in residence at Alexandria, placed in a superior position in the hierarchy to the governors of the provinces. In this respect there was a revival of the ancient Prefect of Egypt, the heir of the kings of the race of Ptolemy; but it was a revival in a highly attenuated form, for the new dignitary had not control of the troops. This force was provided, as everywhere, with special commanders. Here it obeyed the orders of the "Count of Egypt."

In the sphere, already a very large one, which was thrown open to him by legislation, and which he himself enlarged in case of need, the Patriarch had his hands free in quite another sense and modes of action far more efficacious. The officials were at his beck and call. At Constantinople, where he was represented by confidential agents (*apocrisiarii*), either resident or despatched on special missions, we find him constantly taking part in nominations. He had an abundant supply

[1] The comparison is already to be found in the writings of the holy monk, Isidore of Pelusium, a contemporary of Theophilus (*Ep.* i. 152).

of money, and knew how to distribute it to the best effect. A governor who valued his position had to take good care not to displease him; even for the magnificent Augustal Prefect a good understanding with the Pope of Alexandria was a condition of security of tenure. The Government was far away, and the Bishop had a long arm.

As soon as the see of Constantinople had been taken from the Arians, it was felt at Alexandria that the Bishop of the new capital, thenceforward a Catholic, was likely to become a rival of importance. Precautions were at once taken: Alexandrian candidates for the see presented themselves. Maximus was pushed by Bishop Peter, Isidore by Theophilus. But if Peter and Timothy, the brothers of Athanasius, who held his see after him, had known how to resign themselves to their failure in the matter of Maximus, Theophilus on the other hand did not tolerate with patience the success of John of Antioch. He knew him; he had taken his measure at the time of his consecration, and foresaw that, with his character, he would not be long in creating difficulties for himself. Hence he kept an eye upon him, and John, who mistrusted him, was little disposed to join hands with a person of so pushing a disposition.

The arrival of the monks of Nitria placed him in a situation of considerable embarrassment. They explained to him their position, told him that they were weary of finding themselves repulsed everywhere, owing to the fear which Theophilus inspired, and that if he, the Archbishop of Constantinople, did not consent to adjudicate on their case, they would proceed to carry a complaint to the secular tribunals, however great the scandal that might ensue, for they had had enough of their Patriarch.[1] John, without admitting them to communion, which would have been illegal, gave them a lodging in the out-buildings of the Church of the Anastasis, and gave them permission to attend the Offices. Some pious matrons, Olympias and others, undertook their maintenance. The envoys of Theophilus, when consulted by the Archbishop, approved of this arrangement. After this John wrote to the Patriarch, exhorting him to restore his favour to the monks. Theophilus did nothing of the sort; on the contrary,

[1] At the beginning of the year 402, Theophilus in his Festal Letter (Jerome, *Ep.* 98) and Jerome, his faithful echo (*Ep.* 97), complain bitterly of these attacks.

he sent to Constantinople other monks who were charged to accuse the first body, and inasmuch as these had placed a written complaint in John's hands, Theophilus bluntly told his brother of Constantinople that he had no right to receive it, that such a course was forbidden by the canons of Nicæa.[1] John recognized it, and after having seen the failure of new attempts at conciliation decided to abandon the affair.

But the victims of persecution held their ground. They succeeded in obtaining an audience with the Empress, and secured from her two boons: the first, that the accusations of their opponents should be examined by the Prætorian Prefects; the second, that Theophilus should be summoned, and that he should come to Constantinople either willingly or by force to appear before Archbishop John. On the first head, the investigation of the prefects afforded the exiles ground for lodging against their brethren a suit for false accusation, a suit which resulted in the severest sentences. These were not carried out on the spot, for emissaries of Theophilus secured a delay till the arrival of their Patriarch. However, the condemned men were cast into prison, and some of them died there. The coming of Theophilus failed entirely to save the rest, and they were sent to the quarries of Proconnesus.

The second decision, that with regard to the appearance of Theophilus, was less easy to carry out. Theophilus took his time, and as a first step despatched to Constantinople the venerable Epiphanius in whom the crusade at Alexandria against the Origenists seemed to have produced a renewal of youth. He forgot his ninety years, and at the first appeal of the Egyptian Patriarch embarked for Constantinople. At the Hebdomon, where he landed, he celebrated an ordination; and then refusing John's invitation to stay with him proceeded to hold meetings, for worship and otherwise, at which he collected signatures against Origen. All this was highly irregular. Epiphanius had made up his mind to represent John as an Origenist. Everyone whom he did not like or against whom people excited his animosity became an Origenist in his eyes; but his eyes must have been blind indeed for him to think of making of John a disciple of Origen. Completely engrossed in his pastoral duties, John's religious ideas were of a simple,

[1] It was at this time, too, that he drove from his see of Hermopolis the Bishop Dioscorus, who forthwith rejoined his brethren at Constantinople.

homely kind, completely divorced from any sort of theological speculation. He had been brought up at Antioch, in the least Origenist atmosphere in the East, and had always adopted the literal exegesis which was favoured around him: no one had ever seen him following the fantastic paths of allegory.

What of that? John had been pointed out to Epiphanius as an adversary to be encountered. Had he not refused to espouse the quarrel of Theophilus against the monks who were readers of Origen? He could not be anything but an Origenist in disguise. So the Bishop of Salamis advanced to the attack. All the enemies of John in the ranks of the clergy, of the monks, and in society had adopted anti-Origenist principles of the most extreme and uncompromising kind. A great meeting was announced to be held in the Basilica of the Apostles. Epiphanius was to preside: it was anticipated that he would fulminate against Origen, against the Nitrian monks, Origen's disciples, and finally against John, their protector. At the appointed time the aged bishop did, as a matter of fact, present himself: but on the threshold of the Church he was met by Serapion, who, speaking in the name of his Archbishop, invited him to reflect upon the enormity that he was about to commit. Epiphanius was shaken, stopped, and returned to his lodging: then, without waiting, he embarked once more for his island of Cyprus. He was not destined to reach it, for death struck him on the journey. I do not know if he repented: repentance is seldom a characteristic of men of his temperament.

If he had had the perspicacity of Theophilus, instead of creating troubles for Archbishop John, he would have thrown himself into his arms. They were made to understand each other; at anyrate they were astonishingly alike, in the burning zeal which animated both of them, in an equal incapacity for holding commerce with evil when they perceived it, and even for lending themselves to certain accommodations which are sometimes won by circumstances even from the most conscientious of men.

Anyone but the saintly Archbishop would have said that it was incumbent on him to take advantage of the favourable opportunity and establish himself in the good graces of the Court, with the object of exercising a commanding influence in the conflict which was beginning. Far from doing so, John continued with increasing vehemence to thunder against the

vices of the great. Some evil-disposed persons fastened on certain Biblical allusions in his addresses as little in accord with respect for the imperial dignity. If he spoke of Jezebel, it was suggested that he was insulting Eudoxia. Naturally, this method of interpretation was sedulously spread abroad alike by local opponents and by the emissaries of Theophilus. The Patriarch who was kept well informed watched from Alexandria the actions of his colleague and the effects of his eloquence. When he judged that the situation was ripe, he took ship, not concealing that he was going to depose Archbishop John. With this end in view, although the summons was addressed only to himself, he took quite a Council on board with him, some thirty bishops in all; and what was more, a large sum of money and various presents.

On a fine spring day, at high noon, the Egyptian Patriarch cast anchor at the Golden Horn.[1] The harbour was filled with Alexandrian vessels: the sailors of the corn fleet received with acclamations of joy the great religious head of their native land. On landing, Theophilus passed in front of St Sophia without entering it, in front of the Bishop's house, without casting a glance at it, and proceeded to take up his lodging at the Palace of Placidia. John made an effort to win him to his own house; he had prepared apartments for him and for his suite. Theophilus would neither see the Bishop nor set foot in his churches. On the other hand he made such progress in the society of the Court, by his presents, his dinners, and his intrigues of every description that at the end of three weeks all danger had been removed from his own head, and his opponent found himself in a most unfavourable position. All John's enemies had rallied around the Patriarch. Informal meetings took place in the house of Eugraphia, in whose heart there rankled certain observations of her Archbishop on the subject of elderly coquettes, observations of a kind which they never forgive. Evidence was collected, and formal accusations were prepared.

[1] Socrates (*Eccl. Hist.* vi. 15), followed by Sozomen (*Eccl. Hist.* viii. 16), makes him stay first of all at Chalcedon. This is highly improbable, and there seems to be some confusion in the statement. Theophilus had made a stay in Lycia: this follows from a remark which he made against Chrysostom and which Palladius puts in the mouth of the latter (*Dial.* 8); but that is not a justification for maintaining that he traversed Asia Minor by land.

When everything was ready Theophilus crossed the Bosphorus with his train and established himself near Chalcedon, in the villa of the Oak, or villa of Rufinus, the one in which the celebrated Rufinus had been baptized. There was a church there which bore the name of the Apostles Peter and Paul.[1] Around him were assembled, besides his twenty-eight Egyptian bishops, half a dozen of the opposition, the three Syrians already named—Acacius, Severian and Antiochus, Cyrinus the Bishop of Chalcedon, a Mesopotamian whose language was Syriac—Maruthas,[2] and finally Macarius, Bishop of Magnesia *ad Sipylum*.[3] The last offered himself as accuser of his metropolitan Heraclides, who had been installed by John in succession to Antoninus.[4]

It was not a large number: the majority of the bishops who had come to Constantinople in accordance with a regular summons, about forty, had refrained from crossing the Bosphorus and were staying with John. Officially the situation had undergone no change: there was to be a great Council, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Constantinople, and Theophilus was to appear before it to answer charges. But already the attitude adopted towards John by Theophilus and his establishment at the Oak, away from Constantinople, betrayed the ascendancy which the Patriarch had regained in the counsels of the sovereign, and indicated that the accused was likely to be transformed into the judge. However John was requested, on the part of the Emperor, to transfer himself to the Oak and to preside at the trial of Theophilus. A scruple held him back: the canons of 381 forbade him to interfere in the affairs of Egypt. It was his ruin. If he had appeared at the Oak with his bishops, who having been officially summoned could not have been excluded, there is no doubt that he would have succeeded in carrying the day. His

[1] Vol. II., p. 494.

[2] The latter, who must have been somewhat stout, trod on the foot of the Bishop of Chalcedon and wounded him: gangrene was set up in the wound and the unfortunate man died in terrible agonies.

[3] He was a man of learning: he had written a commentary on Genesis and refuted a book against the Christians. On his writings see my monograph, *De Macario Magnetz et Scriptis ejus*, and Schalkhausser, *Zu den Schriften des Makarios von Magnesia*. *Cf.* Vol. I., p. 403.

[4] This matter had, it would seem, been raised before that of John, but difficulties arose which prevented it from being brought to a conclusion.

scruples in the matter of the canons of 381 had not hindered him from interfering in the affairs of Ephesus. The legal question was not then so serious, more especially since the assembly which was about to take place was not the council of a single "Diocese," but a council of the whole of the Empire of the East. The energy of John only sustained him against moral evil; it failed before a difficulty on a point of law. Theophilus, on the other hand, was not a man to disturb himself for so little: his authority, his pride, being at stake, nothing could intimidate him. He won the day.

John's refusal, which both he and the Court clearly expected, enabled Theophilus to give a new aspect to the affair. Since they were not willing to try him, he affected to consider himself as innocent and at once proceeded to reverse the rôles. Two formal accusations had been presented to him, one on behalf of a deacon named John who had been deposed by the Bishop of Constantinople, the other by the monk Isaac. Each of them set out grievances as numerous as they were absurd. Theophilus treated the whole matter *au sérieux* and caused John to be summoned to defend himself. To this summons the bishops who were assembled at Constantinople returned a very dignified reply, declaring that the Bishop of Alexandria remained in the position of an accused person, and that they for their part were ready to try him, having been brought together for the purpose; that they were superior in number and from a larger number of provinces than the collection of bishops gathered round him; and finally, that they had before them a letter in which Theophilus protested against those who wish to interfere in the affairs of another "Diocese." With what effrontery was he, an Egyptian, come to mix himself up with the administration of the Church of Constantinople?

It could not have been better put; but the Council was not in control of the saintly man who was its president. At the same time as this protest, Theophilus received a letter from John who declared himself ready to appear, provided that there did not figure in the number of his judges either Theophilus[1] or

[1] John meant, no doubt, also that his council should unite itself to that of Theophilus; otherwise he would have been too simple in trusting himself to a majority of Egyptian bishops absolutely at the disposal of their Patriarch.

Acacius, or Severian or Antiochus, his declared enemies. His colleagues had raised the question of legality; Chrysostom appealed to equity. Theophilus paid no heed either to the one or the other: a second summons having produced no result, he proceeded *per contumaciam*. Some of the main charges were examined; but it was only on the refusal to appear that the sentence of deposition was founded. It was communicated the same day to the clergy of Constantinople and to the Emperor. The latter was requested to secure the removal of a bishop who was henceforth deprived of his powers; further than this his attention was called to the fact that among the articles of accusation was one which was concerned with acts of *lèse-majesté*—the oratorical allusions to the Empress—and which outstepped the limits of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. They referred this part of the case to him. It was asking for the Archbishop's head.[1]

The Empress refused to go so far: it was merely decided that John should be exiled from Constantinople. This was not very easy to bring about. Not that the clergy would offer a serious resistance: they had been worked upon by the Patriarch of Alexandria, and had already for the most part passed over to the side of the victors. But the populace was on the side of the Archbishop: it was in a state of unrest and made clamorous protests: an outbreak of disturbance was to be feared. They waited for two or three days; and then, since they had to do with a saintly man who was more inclined to relieve the police of trouble than to take advantage of popular feeling, they succeeded in inducing him to go on board a ship which took him to Prænetos on the Gulf of Nicomedia. He never ceased to demand other judges.

On the day after his departure Theophilus, Severian, and the others ventured to show themselves at Constantinople. Theophilus set himself to restore to their places all those whom John had deprived: Severian had the hardihood to preach against the exile. This act of audacity served only to exasperate the populace, and in face of their menacing attitude

[1] The Acts of the assembly, including its report to the Emperor, its notification to the clergy of Constantinople and the reply of Arcadius, were extant down to the time of Photius who has left us (*Cod.* 59) a fully detailed analysis of them. The beginning of the report to the Emperor is in Palladius, *Dial.* c. 8.

Theophilus and his friends thought it prudent to recross the Bosphorus. In their rear alarming affrays took place between the people of Constantinople and the Egyptians of the fleet; and at last the *émeute* made itself heard in the neighbourhood of the imperial palace. Eudoxia, who had been resolute enough up till then, began to feel alarmed; a mysterious accident[1] which happened in her private apartments precipitated a decision. She caused an order to be despatched for bringing the Archbishop back, and sent a notary to him without delay bearing a letter in which she protested that she was in no way responsible for the attack on him. John allowed himself to be brought back. His flock came to meet him; in the evening, when his ship appeared at the entrance of the Bosphorus, he found himself surrounded by a crowd of illuminated vessels. However the Archbishop was not willing to enter the city; they had to land him in the suburbs[2] where he took up his lodging in a house belonging to the Empress. Since he had been deported in execution of the sentence of a council, he wished before resuming his functions that this sentence should have been quashed in due form: he demanded another council. He was not listened to: the disturbance became even more threatening: it was necessary, in order to calm the people, to give them back their Bishop. He was obliged to yield. They transported him to the Holy Apostles, then to St Sophia: the people desired at all costs to see him on his episcopal throne as before. Of formalities, of Canon Law, they would hear nothing. John at last gave way. We still possess, as they were taken down after a fashion in shorthand, the speeches which he made in these amazing hours. Theophilus, of course, is very severely dealt with in them; the people of Constantinople are exalted to the skies: "My Church," said John, "has remained faithful to me: our modern Pharaoh has desired to take it from me as he of old[3] had taken Sara. But once more Sara has remained pure: the adulterers are put to confusion."

[1] Συνέβη θραῦσίν τινα γενέσθαι ἐν τῷ κοιτῶνι, says Palladius (c. 9); Theodoret (*H. E.* v. 34) speaks of a great earthquake. Neither Chrysostom nor Socrates nor Sozomen make any mention of this accident.

[2] Ἐν προαστείῳ ὅ καλεῖται Μαριαναί, says Socrates (*H. E.* vi. 16); ἐν προαστείῳ αὐτῆς τῆς βασιλίδος περὶ τὸν Ἀνάπλουν (Sozomen, *H. E.* viii. 18).

[3] Gen. xii. 14-20.

During these scenes of crisis, Theophilus was effecting a reconciliation with his monks. Isidore, the primary cause of dissension, had not, it would seem, come to Constantinople. He died that same year. Dioscorus and Ammonius also died: the former was buried at St Euphemia,[1] the other in the church of Rufinus, at the Oak, to which in all probability he had betaken himself for the negotiations. These did not take long. Theophilus showed himself very accommodating; the monks withdrew the accusation that they had laid against him; the Patriarch gave them his benediction and pronounced a most elaborate eulogy on Ammonius, the best monk, he said, that he had ever known. Ammonius, even after his death, justified this praise: his tomb wrought many miracles.

The populace of Constantinople gradually returned to quiet; but it still continued to dislike the Patriarch of Alexandria and talked of throwing him into the water. On the other hand, John did not cease to importune the Court to summon a real council, and to cause his case to be reopened. He got his way; but while the letters of summons were being despatched, Theophilus, little pleased by this solution, embarked once more with his suite, bishops, and monks. Such a return brought him little honour: the Alexandrians hissed him on his arrival.

To quench his animosity against John there was perhaps only one means, a drastic one it is true — that advocated by the people of Constantinople. But at the same time to hinder John from getting himself into trouble, it would have been necessary to deprive him of the use of his speech. Two months after his return, matters had already once more taken an unfavourable turn.

In front of St Sophia, at the entrance to the Palace of the Senate, a statue[2] of the Empress was inaugurated with the accompaniment of noisy and undignified sports. The Archbishop took it amiss and proceeded to preach

[1] This is the place which Palladius (*Dial.* c. 17) seems to indicate; Sozomen (*H. E.* viii. 17) speaks of St Mocius; Socrates (*H. E.* vi. 17) of St Peter *in Rufinianis*, but by confusion with Ammonius.

[2] This statue, in silver, was raised on a column of porphyry, the pedestal of which still exists in the Museum of St Irene, with the dedicatory inscriptions in Latin and Greek (*Corpus Inscript. Lat.* iii., No. 736.)

against these demonstrations. He spoke of Herodias and of St John, and his remarks were carried to the Palace, no doubt with additions. Eudoxia, who was easily moved, was inflamed by this, and it was quickly known that John had once more forfeited her favour. However, as he continued to insist on being brought to trial, the bishops at length re-assembled at Constantinople. They were not all favourable to him. The one who in a matter of this kind might have been expected to count the most, and to exert himself the most energetically in John's defence—the venerable Flavian of Antioch—was enfeebled by age and could not render him any assistance. The bishops of Syria were greatly divided: those of Laodicea, Emesa, and Bostra were on the side of John, but those of Tarsus and of Cæsarea in Palestine bore him no good will; while those who led the campaign against him—Acacius, Severian, and Antiochus—were also Syrian bishops. In Asia Minor he had against him the occupants of the important sees of Cæsarea and Ancyra.[1] The attitude of the Government gave cause for uneasiness. In short, John's main support was the populace of the capital. Bishop he was, bishop he desired to remain; but his partisans, with their noisy and enthusiastic demonstrations, gave him in prejudiced eyes the appearance of a tribune of the people.

Theophilus would not come: he declared that he was detained in Egypt by his people, whom he alleged to be so greatly attached to him that they would not let him leave them. He flattered himself, so we may well believe; but, however that may be, even though he did not come, his spirit did not cease to inspire and to direct the enemies of John. It was he who pointed out to them the procedure to follow. Among the canons of Antioch[2] was to be found one—the fourth—which dealt with the case of a bishop who had been deposed by a synod but continued to exercise his functions, declaring that such a bishop lost *ipso facto* the possibility of being restored by another synod or even of making his defence at it. This was precisely John's position.

On arrival at Constantinople the prelates began by entering into communion with the Archbishop—a proceeding which

[1] Leontius of Ancyra enjoyed a great reputation for sanctity.

[2] With regard to these canons, see Vol. II., p. 168, note.

displeased the Court.[1] They speedily divided themselves according to their views. John had forty-two of them upon his side; his adversaries were more numerous. It cannot be said that anything which could properly be called a conciliar decision was given: the proceedings consisted of meetings of sections and of disputes. The Archbishop's friends laid stress on the irregularity, the nullity, of the sentence passed by Theophilus and his supporters, the violence which had been done to John alike to cause him to depart, and to compel him to resume his functions. Further they challenged the authority of these canons of Antioch as having been enacted by partisans of Arius, and demanded that those who used them to buttress their case should state whether they followed the teaching of their authors.

The Christmas celebrations passed without the Emperor coming to church; there was no desire at the palace to hear John's name mentioned. The business dragged on until Easter, obviously because disturbances were feared. At last the opponents of the Archbishop, eager for his destruction, succeeded in overcoming him in Court councils. Twice John was confined in the Bishop's house. On the night before Easter Day, when enormous crowds were wont to assemble for the baptism of catechumens, his clergy and his flock were excluded from the churches. In vain did they attempt to collect in the Baths of Constantine in order to celebrate there the holy vigil and baptism. Soldiers burst in and blood flowed even into the baptismal fonts, from which the neophytes escaped half clad. On the morrow John's flock were obliged to go outside the city, and to celebrate the Holy Mysteries in the open country. Of course the churches were re-opened for his opponents, for the imperial court, and for the section of the populace which did not associate itself with the Archbishop's protests.

The Church of Constantinople was in schism. After the Easter festival there appears to have been a lull. John still remained in his house, closely guarded by his flock, for the

[1] The fourth canon of Antioch pronounced excommunication (ἀποβάλλεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας) against those who wittingly held communion with recalcitrant bishops. But the character of the penalty gives reason for thinking that it was only the laity that the council here had in mind.

worst acts of violence were anticipated, and some attempts at assassination had to be foiled. At last, on June 9, 404, five days after Pentecost, Acacius, Severian, Antiochus, and Cyrinus obtained from the Emperor an order to bring matters to a head. Once more John lent himself to measures calculated to preserve the public peace. The twentieth of June was chosen for the execution of the order of exile. He took leave of the bishops his faithful supporters, then of the beloved deaconesses, Olympias, Pentadia, and others; and at last, leaving them all in tears, he left St Sophia by a back door.

As he was being taken across the Bosphorus, the rumour of his departure began to spread in the crowd which was besieging the outside of the church, and filled the interior. Affrays took place between the faithful who had been outwitted and their triumphant opponents. Suddenly fire seized the episcopal throne and then other parts of the building; in a few minutes the magnificent basilica became an immense furnace. The Palace of the Senate, which was quite close to St Sophia, also caught fire, and in three hours the flames had devoured the two historic buildings and all the houses in the vicinity. In the conflagration there perished the Muses of Helicon, transported from Greece in the time of Constantine, and many other masterpieces of ancient art, which adorned the Senate House. The fire, as we can well believe, was attributed to John's supporters, the Johannites, as they had already begun to be called. Rigorous and even sanguinary prosecutions were undertaken against the exile's best friends: no definite culpability, however, could be proved.

Eight days after the removal of the Archbishop, a successor to him was elected in the person of Arsacius, a priest over eighty years old: he was the brother of the former bishop Nectarius, and had been prominent among the adversaries of John. The latter, who had at first been detained at Nicæa, found assigned to him as his place of exile the little town of Cucusa in Anti-Taurus. He was transported thither under escort with little care for his comfort: he had to suffer *en route* from the harshness and malice of his former colleagues, the Bishops of Ancyra and of Cæsarea. On the other hand the people of Cucusa, with their bishop at their head, gave him the warmest of welcomes.

With John's exile begins an enormous correspondence

between him and his friends in Constantinople, Antioch, everywhere. They came to see him in his retreat, difficult as it was to risk oneself in these mountains where the Isaurians, the Kurds of that day, rendered journeying dangerous. Exiled though he was, he did not cease to interest himself in the works in which he had been engaged, notably in the spreading of the Gospel among the Goths and the missions of Phœnicia. Being now closer to Antioch, he resumed his former relations with that great city. Among his correspondents there, one of the most prominent was the priest Constantius, a man who enjoyed a high reputation for his virtues and his knowledge of affairs.

While these things were happening, on September 26, 404, the old bishop Flavian died, almost a hundred years old. Shortly after, on October 6, came the turn of the Empress Eudoxia. Her disappearance from the scene brought no change. Arcadius remained under the domination of John's enemies, whose position since the fire had become much stronger than before. To this party it was a matter of the highest moment to make itself master of the See of Antioch. Acacius, Severian and Antiochus hurried back to Syria. They had a candidate, a priest named Porphyrius, who was known for his great hostility towards John.[1] John's friends demanded Constantius: the others succeeded in securing his exile. Whilst he was on his way to his friend at Cucusa, the bishops who favoured Porphyrius took advantage of a day when the whole city had gone to Daphne to see the Olympic games, hurried through the election and consecrated him bishop. After this they disappeared. As they had an understanding with the Government, Porphyrius was at once recognized, and shortly afterwards[2] a law was promulgated which excluded from the churches any one who refused to hold communion with the reverend Bishops Arsacius, Theophilus, and Porphyrius.

A threefold cord,[3] difficult to break. It was but strengthened

[1] Palladius represents him as a man of ambition and a priest of ill-repute. Theodoret, who takes the least controversial line in this matter, confines himself (*H. E.* v. 35) to mentioning the works of beneficence which he left behind him and to extolling his mental powers.

[2] *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 4, 6 (November 18, 404).

[3] *Funiculus triplex.*

when in place of the aged Arsacius, who died towards the end of the following year (405), Atticus, another priest of Constantinople and an anti-Johannite of the most pronounced type, had been called to the see of the capital. He was a man of head and hand, admirably qualified to conduct the war which had been begun, and very ready to wage it. It was a ruthless war: bishops and clergy who were favourable to John were deposed wherever it was possible, and not only deposed but proscribed; anyone who sheltered them under his roof was exposed to the penalty of confiscation. Numbers of them were sent into exile, to places of the greatest hardship. One might have thought oneself to be living in the worst days of the reign of Valens.

The situation was complicated by intervention from the West. In the first stage of the affair John had not thought of invoking the protection of Rome. In view of the relations between the two halves of the Empire, this was a very delicate matter. Theophilus, who was under less constraint in this respect than the Bishop of New Rome, and better accustomed to correspond with the Old, was the first to inform Pope Innocent. Even he showed no hurry. His first letter only arrived in the spring of 404. In it he merely stated that he had deposed the Bishop of Constantinople, without giving a reason or mentioning a council. Innocent, disquieted by this unceremonious proceeding, waited for some days, and soon saw the arrival of three bishops sent by John with letters from himself,[1] from the forty bishops who supported him, and lastly from the clergy of Constantinople. These letters, which had been despatched soon after Easter, contained an account of what had happened up to that time. The signatories protested against the wickedness of Theophilus and the irregularities of his procedure: they invoked the support of the Pope as well as of the Metropolitans of Milan and of Aquileia to whom similar letters had been addressed.

Innocent replied to Theophilus and to John, quashing (ἀθετήσας) the sentence passed on the Archbishop of Constantinople. He declared that a new council must be summoned, to be composed of Easterns and Westerns, with the exclusion of friends and enemies, to render an impartial judgement. Then, as Theophilus had ended by sending him the Acts

[1] This is preserved in the *Dialogue* of Palladius, c. 2.

of his council, the Pope saw from these that John had been condemned by thirty-six bishops, of whom twenty-nine were Egyptians. This in itself told him the secret of the comedy; he ran through the list of plaints set out and found in them nothing of importance. Theophilus received a letter in severer terms,[1] in which he was informed that he was to present himself at the council which was to be called: the proceedings would be according to the canons of Nicæa, the only ones recognized by the Roman Church.

In the meantime events moved fast at Constantinople. John departed for exile: his supporters who had been driven out began to arrive in large numbers in Rome, where, despite Arcadius' police, they met with an excellent reception. In vain did emissaries of Acacius endeavour to fasten on John responsibility for the burning of St Sophia. Not only from Constantinople, but from Thessalonica, from Caria and even as far as from Mesopotamia, priests and bishops flocked in and produced a mournful series of evidences. The Pope at length communicated the whole of these facts to the Emperor Honorius, and the Emperor collected a certain number of bishops who besought him to procure the holding of a great council at Thessalonica. Honorius gave his consent: his letters and those of the Pope, of the Bishops of Milan, Aquileia and others, were entrusted to a mission consisting of five Italian prelates and two Roman priests, who set out for Constantinople accompanied by Palladius and three other Greek bishops, partisans of Chrysostom. On arriving at Athens these dignitaries were hindered from proceeding to Thessalonica, where they wished to make arrangements with the Bishop Anysius, and were taken straight to Constantinople. They did not enter the city. From the customs house they were forced to go back to the Castle of Athyra on the Propontis, where they were exceedingly badly treated. On being summoned to recognize Atticus, they refused; whereupon the letters of which they were the bearers were violently taken from them and the Latin bishops were re-embarked for Italy. As for the Greek prelates, they were retained in order to be sent into exile. It was then that Palladius returned to Egypt and was taken to Syene, in the neighbourhood of the Blemmyes, whilst his colleagues were scattered in the deserts of Libya and of Syria.

[1] Palladius, *Dial.* c. 3; Jaffé *Regesta*, 288.

No course remained open to Innocent save to renounce all communion with the opponents of John and to do his best to comfort the unfortunate exile; and that is what he did. At this moment political discord was rife between the two parts of the Empire. Stilicho ever cherished his dream of re-annexing Illyricum; and with this end in view he availed himself of Alaric. The Gothic chieftain had seen his first attempt at establishment in Italy fail at the Battle of Pollentia (402). Being compelled to recross the Julian Alps, he had made peace with his conqueror and was preparing to march with him on Constantinople. We can imagine what must have been, in times like these, the relations between the two Emperors: the representations of Honorius in regard to the internal affairs of the Eastern Empire had not much chance of being received with favour.

In this way all John's friends had been reduced to impotence: he could do no more than exchange with them testimonies of fidelity and affection. Innocent wrote to him several times. At length all this correspondence, all these visits which (especially from Antioch) were constantly paid to Cucusa,[1] ended by alarming his persecutors. Porphyrius and Severian secured the removal of their victim to a greater distance. A new place of exile was assigned to him, and he was sent to Pityus, a place on the Black Sea, at the foot of the Caucasus, far away from roads of communication and from civilization. He never reached it. He was taken with brutality across the mountains of Pontus, without regard to his age and infirmities: if they came to a town where he might have found some relief, they hurried on to camp in a place where no resources were to be found. Thus it came about that he slept his last night near Comana in a country chapel, dedicated to a local martyr, St Basilicus. In a dream he saw the saint, who invited him to rejoin him on the morrow. He did in fact on the next day find himself worse. In spite of his representations, his keepers insisted on his setting out and hastened the departure. But after a few miles the poor Bishop was in such a condition that they were obliged to return to the little chapel. He died there the same day. "Glory to God in all things!" such were the last words which issued from the Golden-mouth.

[1] For some time Bishop John resided at Arabissus, Cucusa having been found exposed to the incursions of the Isaurians.

Stretched now upon the floor of a country oratory, in the recesses of a forgotten land, Archbishop John could no longer be an object of fear to anyone. His friends were scattered, exiled, reduced to misery, imprisoned. Their voices were lifted to bless his memory; but no one save God heard them. Throughout the whole of the Orient wickedness enjoyed its triumph. Theophilus continued to rule over Egypt. It was not Jerome's fault if his high deeds were not applauded in the West. Scarcely had the Patriarch published something against the Origenists or against Chrysostom but Jerome hastened to translate it. It is through his pains and in his Latin version that there have come down to us these works of hate.[1] The last is an invective of a shameful character. John was represented in it as possessed of an impure spirit, as an impious person, a robber, a profaner, a Judas, a Satan, for whom Hell would never hold enough torments. Jerome thought this splendid. The Patriarch desired to make known to the Latins the character of his rival: he adopted his views and translated it.[2] Pammachius and Marcella, to whom he communicated these effusions,[3] must have ended by finding themselves disturbed by them. The Roman world was amply informed by the Johannite bishops, a goodly number of whom were receiving ready hospitality in the houses of Pinianus and the younger Melania. We have seen what were the feelings of Pope Innocent. Jerome's attitude, with his enthusiasm for Theophilus, could not fail to be regarded with disfavour. His correspondence with his friends at Rome seems to have slackened about this time.

It was a long while since Origen's day. But Jerome had not forgotten him. For him, Origen lived once more in Rufinus, and Theophilus was the Destroying Angel of this disturbing monster. It was for that that he forgave him so many things. Theophilus, it is said, satisfied with having made his enemy bite the dust, began to forget the pretext of the

[1] *Ep.* 92 (a circular letter to the bishops of Palestine); *Epp.* 96, 98, 100 (Festal Letters of 401, 402, 404); *Ep.* 113 (on the despatch of the book against Chrysostom).

[2] The copyists have been disgusted more than he was: of Theophilus' pamphlet, there remain to us only citations by Facundus (*Def. trium. capit.* vi. 5; Migne, *P. L.*, vol. lxvii., p. 677), and the beginning of a covering letter to Jerome (*Ep.* 113).

[3] *Ep.* 97.

quarrel. He was often to be seen absorbed in the reading of Origen. If any one expressed surprise he would reply, "The works of Origen are like a meadow, in which there are beautiful flowers and some noxious plants: it all rests in choosing." That was what Rufinus also thought. Then why destroy the whole.[1]

[1] In the course of this chapter I have several times alluded to St John of Constantinople by the surname of Chrysostom. It is as well to remember that this designation is not found earlier than the 7th century.

CHAPTER IV

THE END OF DONATISM

WHILST the Eastern Empire resounded with these disputes, Latin Africa was releasing itself painfully from the terrible schism which had rent it ever since the time of Constantine. And here we must retrace our steps a little.[1]

At the first news of the proceedings of the Cæsar Julian the Emperor Constantius had taken measures to safeguard his authority in Africa.[2] It was only after his death that his rival was recognized there, to the great joy of the Donatists. For them the change was a deliverance. The union established in the last years of Constans had been maintained since, under Magnentius and under Constantius. No doubt in many places the populace had been disposed to come to terms and had actually done so. But there remained some irreconcilables whom force alone had been able to bend and who straightened themselves again in a moment; there remained in certain districts groups sufficiently strong or sufficiently removed from the centre to have been able to escape from the control of the Government; above all, there remained in places of exile bishops and deported clergy, embittered by isolation and persecution. Julian speedily received their application, drawn up in the name of one of the most important of them, Bishop Pontius, and some others. In this they made an appeal to his justice.[3] The new Emperor must have heard Donatism spoken of: he knew what a scourge it was for African Christianity. Hence he hastened to grant pardon to the exiles: the attitude of his officials was changed without delay to one of neutrality between the two parties.

The Donatists did not enjoy a peaceful triumph. Optatus[4]

[1] Vol. II., Chap. iii., p. 79 ff.

[2] Ammianus, xxi. 7.

[3] Optatus ii. 16; *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 37; Augustine, *c. Litteram Petiliani*, iii. 92.

[4] Optatus ii. 16-26; vi. 5-8.

who saw them at work, tells us the story of their return in no unmoved fashion. Naturally, they hurled themselves on their churches and drove the Catholics out of them with violence if need served.[1] In answer to their call the larger part of the masses who had submitted to reunion returned noisily to schism. When the churches had been recovered, they set themselves to disinfect them by repeated lustrations; sacred things found in them could only be considered as profane, for the Catholic priests possessed, in the eyes of their opponents, no sacerdotal power. The altars were broken, or at any rate scraped: the Chrism was thrown out of the window and the Eucharist to the dogs. As for those who had accepted union and had taken part in the sacraments of the "traditors," they were subjected to penance whether they were clergy or simple lay folk. Needless to say, the consecrations of virgins, the ordinations, the baptisms,[2] and all the ceremonies performed during the union were declared void and repeated.

The disappearance of Julian from the scene made no material change in the situation. Valentinian, as we have seen, was little disposed to take a side in ecclesiastical controversies. He did not alter the policy of his predecessor. The exiles remained in the country, and the relations of the

[1] Optatus tells us of several incidents which occurred at Lemellef, Tipasa, Carpi, and Tysedis; but it is chiefly the general features that we must bear in mind here.

[2] The Donatist, Tychonius (*vide infra*, p. 79), gave an account of a great council held at Carthage in the early days of the schism by 270 bishops belonging to his party. It was there decided, after protracted debates, to admit the "traditors" to communion without imposing on them, if they did not wish it, a new baptism. He cited in particular the case of one Deuterius, Bishop of Macriana, who had acted in this way, and with whom the great Donatus had always remained on good terms. This was further the universal practice in Mauritania, down to the enforced union of 347 (Aug. *Ep.* xciii. § 43). The persons here in question are not Catholics baptized in their church since the beginning of the schism who had passed over later to the ranks of the Donatists, but "traditors" properly so-called, *immensi criminis rei*, persons who had been baptized before the schism, in the still united Church, and consequently validly baptized even in the eyes of the schismatics. The question debated in the council then was whether backsliding subsequent to this baptism had or had not destroyed its effect. Such had been, immediately after the persecution, the opinion of Donatus of Casae Nigrae (Vol. II., p. 87). At Rome too, after the Council of Ariminum, there were to be found fanatics (Vol. II., p. 285) who maintained that those who had accepted its formulas must be rebaptized.

dissentients whether with the Catholics or with the Imperial authorities practically assumed once more the character which they had possessed in the last days of Constantine and down to about 347.

Roman Africa reflected the general weakening of the Empire. Ever and again the tribes of the desert made their appearance to hurl themselves on the frontier which was often dismantled of its defences and too weak to stay their inroads. In the interior the Berber peoples who had retained their autonomy were in a state of unrest and sought for and assumed positions which gave cause for alarm. The result was an ever-increasing preponderance of the military authorities. The Proconsul and the Vicarius, officials of very high rank, but civilians, counted for little in the counsels of the Count of Africa, who was the commander of the army. This position was occupied at that time by Romanus,[1] who owed his appointment to Jovian. He was a cruel and rapacious man, more ready to plunder the provinces than to defend them. Everyone complained of him, but the favour of Remigius, the "Master of the Offices," prevented the accusations from reaching the Emperor. The Donatists reckoned him in the number of their persecutors; but they were not the only sufferers from his administration. This was prolonged for a considerable time, about a dozen years, and ended in a catastrophe.

The two Bishops of Carthage at that time were Restitutus for the Catholics and Parmenian for the dissidents. The former, who had been one of the leaders of the Council of Ariminum, had had no small share in the backsliding of that assembly. It would seem that even under the orthodox emperors he maintained his unhappy attitude. St Athanasius was obliged to bring pressure to bear on the Africans to make them abandon the Creed of Ariminum and attach themselves to that of Nicæa.[2] This fact, in combination with the ecclesiastical

[1] Ammianus, xxvii. 9.

[2] Vol. II., pp. 238, 374, 375. The Africans took but a small share in the great conflicts that arose out of Arianism. In 343 the "Eastern" Council of Sardica had addressed its circular letter (*cf.* Vol. II., p. 173) to Donatus of Carthage. The latter, if we are to believe St Jerome, seems to have written a book on the Holy Spirit in an Arian sense ("Ariano dogmati congruens," *De Viris*, 93). St Augustine (*Ep.* clxxxv. 1), on the whole, exonerates the Donatists and Donatus himself from any compromise with Arianism. Gratus, Bishop of Carthage, seems to have attended the Council

isolation which followed, was ill-calculated to strengthen the position of orthodoxy in Africa in face of resuscitated Donatism. And this was the more to be regretted because the dissidents had given to their illustrious chief Donatus, who had died in exile, a successor who was himself a man of high distinction: Parmenian did not confine himself to ruling his sect; he wrote in its defence.

It was as a reply to one of his writings that Optatus, the Bishop of Milevis (Mileu) in Numidia, published about 370 a treatise in six books[1] in which he relates the early history of the schism, combats the principles on which it was endeavoured to support it, removes the reproaches which were wont to be made to the Catholics on the score of the coercive measures which had been enacted and executed by the Government, and finally censures his opponents for their rebaptisms and for the uncompromising aversion which they showed for religious tranquillity.

Nothing of any special importance seems to have resulted from this controversy between the two bishops. The Donatists were irreconcilable. There was no way of persuading them to oral debates whether in private or in public. Certain differences of attitude may, however, be discerned in their ranks. About the time at which we have arrived, one of them, Tychonius, who was deeply versed in the study of the Bible[2] and had a considerable bent for controversy, published among other works a treatise[3] entitled "Intestine Warfare," in which

of Sardica, of which he speaks in one of his canons (c. 5, *cf.* Vol. II., p. 194). The heretical formula of 357 was condemned in Africa (Hilary, *Contra Const.* 76); the bishops responsible for this open step were persecuted. In 358 there were four African bishops at Sirmium who signed the formulas put forward by the Homoiousians against the Anomœans (Sozomen, *H. E.* iv. 15; *cf.* Vol. II., p. 232). The large number of bishops collected at Ariminum in the following year is a reason for thinking that an appeal had been extensively made to the African body.

[1] Some fifteen years later Optatus revised his book and completed it with a view to a second edition which does not seem to have been reached. What is known as the Seventh Book belongs to this corrected work.

[2] We still possess a treatise of Tychonius on Seven Rules of Interpretation, which was highly esteemed by St Augustine (*De Doctr. Christ.* iii. 30 ff.). His commentary on the Apocalypse is lost; but we can reconstruct it for the most part by the aid of the Catholic authors who have made use of it, such as Primasius, Cassiodorus, Bede, and Beatus.

[3] *De Bello Intestino*, a lost work.

he enunciated principles which had very little Donatism about them. He admitted that the true Church is that which is spread throughout the whole world, and that it does not lose its character as the Church in the true sense from the fact that it contains an admixture of sinners with the righteous. With such views Tychonius might have been expected to abandon his sect. The inconsistency in which he was involved by remaining in it was pointed out to him by a reply from the principal leader, Parmenian himself.[1] Others, without however grounding themselves on the principles of Tychonius, went further than he did and formed a body apart. Hence there arose schisms within the ranks—the Claudianists in Proconsular Africa, the Urbanists of Numidia, the Rogatists of Mauritania. The last named were headed by the Bishop of Cartenna (Ténès); they formed a section of some importance,[2] distinguished from the general body of Donatists by an inferior degree of ferocity. There were no Circumcellions among them.

In 372 the country in which they lived was the scene of sanguinary conflicts.[3] Nubel, one of the great Moorish chiefs who were subject to the Empire, chanced to die, leaving a large but disunited family. One of his sons, Namma, a protégé of Count Romanus, was assassinated by Firmus, his own brother. Pursued by Romanus, Firmus deemed that he could best secure his safety by revolting and setting himself up as a Pretender. He succeeded in seducing from their allegiance a body of Roman troops, and a tribune of the regular army took off his collar and made him a crown. Mauritania, which had been exasperated by the exactions of Romanus, rose almost to a man; while the peoples of the Atlas who had been more or less subdued took part in the revolt. Romanus was unsuccessful in curbing the movement, and even in preventing Firmus from burning to ashes the town of Cæsarea, the capital of the country. In some aspects it was

[1] A lost letter, which can be reconstructed in part from a refutation devoted to it later by St Augustine (*Contra Ep. Parmeniani*, libri iii.).

[2] In his letter (*Ep.* 93) to Vincentius, the successor of Rogatus, which was written about 408, St Augustine speaks of ten or eleven Rogatist bishops. But in the forty years which had elapsed since its origin, this little church had passed through evil days and no doubt had had many losses.

[3] Ammianus, xxviii. ff.

a war of religion: the Donatists had taken the side of the usurper. Whilst he was master, Catholics and Rogatists[1] had to endure evil times.

But Valentinian intervened. A distinguished general, Theodosius, the father of the future Emperor, landed in Africa with troops that could be relied upon. Romanus was immediately arrested and sent to the Court, and the insurrection which had assumed enormous proportions was in the end put down. Firmus, driven to despair, hanged himself at the moment when he was about to be handed over to Theodosius. When these passions had been allayed, things returned to their former condition. The Government, of course, could not fail to be more unfavourably disposed to the Donatists who had been compromised in the rebellion. It is for this reason, no doubt, that we find, in 373, 377, and 379, laws against the practice of Rebaptism.[2] Little was done to put them into execution, at any rate in places where the Donatists were the masters, and especially in Numidia. The Circumcellions reappeared, making havoc of the country districts: in the towns very strange scenes were to be witnessed. One day the Donatist Bishop of Hippo forbade the bakers to bake bread for the Catholics, of whom there were but few in the place. One of their deacons had a Donatist baker as a lodger: he could not induce him to put his dough in the oven.[3] Everywhere that they could, the sectaries devoted themselves to harassing the Catholics. The least that they did was to shun all communication with them, all conversation, especially on the subject of the schism.

It was in these conditions—conditions generally speaking of extreme misery—that the African Church lived or vegetated during the thirty years which followed the death of Constantius and the return of the proscribed Donatists. Optatus is the only Catholic writer of whom we find mention: of councils, of the Bishop of Carthage, we hear nothing further. It is only in 390 that we meet with a successor of St Cyprian—a certain

[1] Aug. *Ep.* 93; *Contra Litt. Petiliani*, ii. 83.

[2] *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 6, 1, 2; 5, 5. One of them was addressed (Vol. II., p. 505, note 2) to the *Vicarius* Nicomachus Flavianus, a Pagan by conviction, and so favourable to the Donatists that they considered him one of themselves.

[3] Aug. *Contra Litt. Petil.* ii. 83.

Genethlius who is known as having brought together two provincial councils, one in an official residence (*in praetorio*), the other in the basilica called "Perpetua Restituta." Of the latter there remain a dozen canons, all dealing with ordinary discipline and devoid of interest for the history of local disputes. Relations were always maintained with the Apostolic See. Pope Siricius sent to Africa about this time the ordinances of a Roman council held in 386, in which he strongly enjoins the observance of ecclesiastical celibacy. The Church of Africa was doubtless represented, in 391, at the Council of Capua, for in subsequent years we find it exhibiting the utmost respect for the decisions of that assembly.

This year 391 marks an epoch in the history of African Christianity. It was then that there appear on the scene the three men who were for long to play the principal parts upon it—Augustine, who in this very year became a priest at Hippo; Aurelius and Primianus, who at Carthage replaced Genethlius and Parmenian respectively at the head of the two rival communions. It was then too that crises occurred in the bosom of Donatism which were destined to reduce it to weakness, while on the Catholic side there begins to develop a course of action marked by intelligence and perseverance which was destined in the long run to put an end to this lamentable division.

Africa was now subject to a native ruler, Gildo, another son of Nubel, who was invested with even more extensive powers[1] than the previous Counts of Africa. He had been established in 387, and held his position for nearly twelve years. In the time of Romanus and the elder Theodosius he had borne arms against his brother Firmus, and had found the Donatists among his adversaries. Now he showed them favour. It was in the neighbourhood of Mt. Aurasius, a military district, that the schism had always had its strongest positions: Bagaï and Thamugad for the Donatists were like Holy Cities. Just at this time the see of Thamugad was filled by a regular bandit named Optatus. Strong through the friendship of Gildo, which caused him to be dubbed Optatus the Gildonian, he was to be found everywhere where there was an ill deed to be done in his own interest or in that of his sect. He soon

[1] *Comes et magister utriusque militiae per Africam* (*Cod. Theod.* ix. 7, 9).

became the terror of Numidia: the fear of him extended as far as Carthage and to the recesses of Mauritania, where he went periodically to harry the Rogatists. This Episcopal scourge was able in some respects to promote the interests of the Donatists; but on the whole and before the public opinion of Africa he compromised them.

A scandal of another kind arose from broils between some members of the Donatist clergy of Carthage and their new bishop, Primianus.[1] The latter, for reasons of which we are imperfectly informed, set some of his deacons against him, notably a certain Maximian who belonged to the family of the great Donatus. Maximian was deprived by a very summary procedure. He resisted. On his side, as in earlier days on the side of Majorinus, there appeared a *grande dame* possessed of influence and a turn for intrigue, who set herself to organize a party in his interest and invoked the assistance of the episcopate. Forty-three bishops assembled themselves at Carthage in defiance of Primianus, who refused to see them and to appear before them. They adjourned themselves to another council which took place towards the end of June 393, at Cabarsussi in Byzacena. About a hundred bishops were present. Primianus refrained from appearing: he was sentenced *per contumaciam* and deposed on various grounds,[2] principally because he had shown himself too easy in admitting the Claudianists to communion. Maximian took his place: he was elected and consecrated at Carthage in the usual form by a dozen of the neighbouring bishops; but Primianus had not relinquished his post. The Donatists who had deposed him belonged to the eastern provinces, Africa Proconsularis, Byzacena, and Tripolitana. He appealed from them to the episcopate of Numidia, who still formed as they had done at the beginning the principal strength of the party. Three hundred and ten bishops met together after Easter (April 24, 394) in the following year in the church of Bagaï. Affecting to ignore the Council of Cabarsussi and its sentence, the assembly[3] admitted Primianus among its members; then,

[1] St Augustine refers to this business again and again: see especially *Contra Cresconium*, lib. iv.

[2] The sentence has been preserved by St Augustine, *Sermon* 2 on Psalm xxxvi. c. 20 (*Opera*, vol. xi., p. 1185).

[3] *Ibid.* p. 1189.

without even troubling itself to confirm the deprivation of Maximian, it proceeded against his twelve consecrators and they were deposed. As for the bishops who had given their adhesion to his intrusion, they were given till Christmas for repentance.

They did not all return to a better mind—far from it: Maximian's schism reached deep down. The dissidents had to suffer considerably. On one side Optatus and his fierce Circumcellions waged a merciless war against them and struck them down without ceremony. On the other Primianus and his supporters invoked the laws against dissenters—laws of which they themselves complained so strongly and which had been directed against them. The magistrates, daunted by their boldness and by the authority of the great Council of Bagaï, allowed sentences of expulsion to be extorted from them. One of Maximian's consecrators, Salvius, Bishop of Membressa, was subjected to shameful indignities. Since his own flock could not be relied upon to put him out, an appeal was made to the people of Abitina, a neighbouring town. These hastened to the spot with exultation, seized hold of the old bishop, and after making him a necklace of dead dogs, proceeded to dance round him like savages to the accompaniment of obscene songs.

These occurrences had been followed with attention by the Catholics. They saw reproduced in the very bosom of Donatism all the details of the schisms of 313—a Bishop of Carthage repudiated by a section of his clergy; the bishops of the province called to take cognizance of the affair, and ending by siding against the bishop, by deposing him; one of his clergy ordained in opposition to him; the former bishop extricating himself from this position by decisions given at a distance, and by the help of the public authority. That no point of resemblance might be wanting, now as in former days there was a woman in the case, a matron of Carthage who filled the part of her ancestress, Lucilla. With what grace, men said to the supporters of Primianus, with what grace do you reproach us with Cæcilian, Miltiades, and the magistrates of Constantine? You have just repeated their story.

However, Gildo adopted in politics an attitude which was open to suspicion. It is true that he had not recognized the "usurper" Eugenius; but he had not aided Theodosius to

put him down. When the Emperor was dead, he was seen opposing Stilicho and intriguing with Eutropius. There were times when he put obstacles in the way of the despatch of corn-supplies, on which depended the feeding of Rome. "Our bread is at the mercy of the Moor," said the poet Claudian.[1] In 397 he threw off the mask entirely and joined Africa to the empire of Arcadius. The senate, adopting the language of olden days, declared him a public enemy. At the beginning of the year 398 a fleet crossed to Africa. The army which disembarked from it was under the leadership of Mascezel, Gildo's own brother, who had quarrelled with him shortly before and had passed into the service of Stilicho. The campaign did not last more than a few days. Defeated at Ammaedara (Haïdra) Gildo took to flight, reached the sea and took ship: a mishap in navigating it brought him back to Tabraca, where he was arrested and strangled himself as his brother Firmus had done, twenty-five years before. Optatus of Thamugad, who was deeply involved in the rebellion, was also arrested and died in prison.

However the Catholics had not waited to help themselves till Heaven should rid them of their enemies. Whilst the Donatists hostile to Primianus were gathering at Cabarsussi (393), the Catholic bishops were assembling at Hippo under the presidency of Aurelius of Carthage. The Church of Hippo, inconsiderable in numbers, and swamped as it were in the midst of a dissenting population, had at its head at this time an old bishop of Greek origin whose name was Valerius. A place in his *entourage* had been occupied for the last two years as a priest by Augustine of Thagaste, not so long ago a renowned rhetor, celebrated at Carthage, at Rome, and at Milan, but for some years withdrawn from the world. In the past he had led a lax life, which was tormented, however, by the goadings of religion. For a time he had been a Manichean: later he joined the school of the Neo-Platonists.[2] In the end

[1] *De Bello Gildonico*, v. 70: "Pascimur arbitrio Mauri."

[2] It was in the translations of C. Marius Victorinus that St Augustine had made the acquaintance of Plato and the Platonists. Victorinus became a Christian in the early years of Pope Liberius (352-366); he undertook with zest the defence of orthodoxy against Arianism, but he had been converted late in the day; his controversial writings and some others of his which remain to us present a curious combination of Christianity and the Neo-Platonist philosophy. On his conversion see Aug. *Conf.* viii. 5;

he attached himself to St Ambrose and attended his instructions. It was then that he heard the call of God, and received baptism from the hands of the illustrious bishop. Since that time he had been living in Africa, aloof from any kind of worldly preoccupation, absorbed in religious studies and in good works. When he found himself on a casual journey at Hippo, the populace, who knew his worth, acclaimed him as a priest. Valerius, all the more glad to have such an assistant because he found some difficulty in speaking in Latin, soon wished to make sure of having him as his successor. He caused him to be consecrated bishop (395), a rather irregular proceeding[1]; however, he died a few months later, and Augustine by himself ruled the Church of Hippo.

From the days of St Cyprian and even earlier, Councils had had great prominence as an institution in Africa.[2] In the 4th

on his writings, Schanz, *Geschichte der röm. Litt.*, iv. p. 137 ff. The influence of Victorinus on Augustine has been greatly exaggerated; Augustine did not come into personal contact with the celebrated rhetor; he owes to him only his acquaintance with the Platonist writings and also the example of his conversion. Victorinus must have ceased his functions as a teacher in consequence of the edicts of Julian (Vol. II., p. 263-4); he no doubt died shortly after.

[1] The eighth canon of Nicæa, which was cited in this connexion, bears no reference to this case, except in the revision of Rufinus (c. 10). It is true that, quite apart from any written enactment, it was an immemorial rule that there ought to be but one bishop in each place; but it is no less clear that the inconveniences for which this traditional law was a remedy were not to be feared in the case of Valerius and Augustine.

[2] The literary tradition of the African Councils goes back in the last resort to a *Liber canonum* preserved in the archives of the Church of Carthage: it was read at the Council of 525. After the canons of Nicæa it contained the African canons, council by council, following the order of succession of the Bishops of Carthage, with short prefaces. From this lost work are derived: (1) the *Breviatio canonum* of Fulgentius Ferrandus (Migne, *Patrologia Lat.*, tom. lxvii., p. 949), a compilation in order of subjects, drawn up at Carthage before the middle of the 6th century; (2) the African collection inserted in the *Hispana* (Maassen, *Quellen*, vol. i., p. 772): this contains the Councils of 348, 390, 397, 401, 419, and various canons of other Councils (402-8)—the *Concilium Carthaginiense IV.* of this collection has nothing to do with Africa: it is the Code of Arles, *Statuta Ecclesiae antiqua*; (3) the Council of 419. To this Council, assembled in reference to an appeal to Rome (*vide infra*, c. vii.), are to be found annexed, at least in some MSS., two collections of canons (1-33, 34-127), or rather a collection of canons (1-33) and a selection from the councils held down to that time under Aurelius. The collection of canons, except

century Donatists and Catholics held several of them, though they do not seem to have been assembled at the regular intervals characteristic of the middle of the previous one. In the matter of Catholic Councils, we only know of that of Gratus, which was due to quite special circumstances, and the two of Genethlius. The bishops assembled at Hippo, convinced that "L'union fait la force," resolved to restore this institution and enacted[1] that in future there should be a council every year. To make the holding of it easier, it was laid down that besides the bishops of the province in which the council should be summoned, there should be present two legates of the other provinces, invested with the powers of their colleagues.

The instrument was created, but everything depended on putting it to regular use. It was to this that Archbishop Aurelius devoted himself. The new head of the Church of Africa assuredly did not possess the culture of Augustine; but his lofty character, his resolute and conciliatory temper, his strong common sense, his imperturbability, all qualified him to preside at the helm of a Church which had been woefully crippled. Between Augustine and him there was always complete agreement. Aurelius was not the man to be even tempted to blind jealousy of the radiant glory of his illustrious

for the last five, is made up of canons taken from previous councils: the names of the bishops proposing the canons have been changed. In the second part (34-127) the series of councils laid under contribution extends from the Council of Hippo in 393 down to the Council of Carthage of May 1, 418; many things have been omitted in the process of selection. The collection ends with some added documents relating to the matter of the appeals; the last belongs to 421. Looked at as a whole it has the appearance of a *dossier*, drawn up with a view to supporting the African contention in regard to appeals to Rome, rather than of a collection of disciplinary enactments. This collection, known under the name of *Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Africanae*, was translated into Greek and inserted in the books of Byzantine Canon Law. In Latin we possess it in the collection of Dionysius Exiguus (*P. L.*, tom. lxvii., p. 181), and in many others which seem all to have borrowed it from Dionysius. Apart from this tradition should be mentioned here the *Breviarium Hipponense*, an abridgement of the Canons of Hippo (393), drawn up four years after the Council, at the instigation of Aurelius of Carthage and Musonius, the Primate of Byzacena. It is often to be found in collections of canons along with the Council of Telepte (418), which is a Byzacene Council.

[1] Canon 18. I cite it according to the Conciliar Code of 419, as it is inserted in the collection of Dionysius Exiguus (Migne, *P. L.*, tom. lxvii., p. 181 f.)

colleague any more than Augustine, on the other hand, would have entertained the remotest idea of putting himself in the place of his chief in the general management of the Church. In certain respects Aurelius and Augustine were each the complement of the other: they present to us an Ambrose in two persons—the governor and the teacher. Augustine, it is plain, to a great extent inspired Aurelius: Aurelius gave to Augustine's views the authority of his see, of his person, and of his councils.

The bishops assembled at Hippo seem to have said to themselves that before waging war on the dissidents, they must first render themselves free from possibility of reproach. The greater part of their decisions are directed to the restoration of discipline. The Council of Hippo is a Reforming Council. There is scarcely any mention of the schism, and then only to settle the position of certain classes of Donatists who had been reconciled to the Church. Gildo was reigning at this time, and Optatus of Thamugad was his prophet: it was not the moment to take steps against Primianus. Still, councils were held in the years that followed; but it seems that difficulties were interposed in the way of communications with the ecclesiastical authorities of Italy and the Imperial Court of the West. The policy of Gildo was hardly favourable to relations of this kind. The Council of Capua, in 391, had imposed very hard terms on the Donatist clergy who asked for union. This ordinance, which was contrary to their old custom, was a source of embarrassment to the Africans; they may well have been anxious to secure some mitigation. At Hippo they determined to consult the Church beyond the sea.[1] But in 397 the consultation had still to be made.[2] It was decided upon for the second time this year, at the General Council of Carthage. This Council asked in addition that persons who had been baptized, before attaining years of discretion, in the Donatist Church, should not be treated as incapable of entering

[1] *Brev. Hipp.* 37. The Council of Capua had decided that no Donatist should be received *cum suo honore*. The Council of Hippo asked for the exemption of those who had not practised Rebaptism, or priests and bishops who came into union with the whole of their flock. The ranks of the clergy were being manned with difficulty.

[2] We have information, in 394, of a Provincial Council at Carthage, and of a General Council at Hadrumetum in Byzacena.

Holy Orders.[1] The request seems to have been addressed to Pope Siricius and to Simplician, the Bishop of Milan.

We must suppose that the revolt of Gildo and the repression which followed stayed for some time longer the renewal of communications, for they were re-established only under the successors of Siricius and Simplician, Anastasius and Venerius. The Council held at Carthage on June 16, 401, sent delegates to Italy to these two prelates and to the Emperor, with a view to obtaining from the former the dispensations necessitated by the scarcity of men; and from the sovereign an energetic course of action against paganism and the repression of certain abuses more or less connected with it. In the month of September at another meeting of bishops, Aurelius was able to communicate very kindly letters from Pope Anastasius, but no concessions had yet been obtained, at any rate in respect to the priests or bishops who were returning to the Church with their flocks. Further representations had to be made and were no doubt successful, for without much delay we see the desired admissions taking place on a very large scale.

To open wide the door to those who came over was a good thing; but now a more direct procedure had become possible. In this year, 401, Africa had passed into the hands of a powerful Count, Bathanarius, brother-in-law of Stilicho, who governed it until 408. The Donatists had been too deeply involved with Gildo for the government of Honorius to be inclined to forget their transgressions, old or new.

However, an attempt was made first of all to proceed by kindness. The officials were bidden to hold an enquiry in all the places where the supporters of Maximian had possessed churches, as to what had occurred at the time when they had split off from the other Donatists: formal records were to be drawn up; then delegates from the Council were to be sent to the Donatist bishops and parishes to shew them that they had no longer ground of complaint against the Catholics—that the

[1] Persons baptized in schism were admitted into the Catholic Church not by a new baptism, their own being considered valid, but by a ceremony analogous or identical with Confirmation, but not unrelated to the Reconciliation of Penitents. The imposition of hands which formed part of it was doubtless *ad accipiendum Spiritum sanctum* but also *in poenitentiam*. As the condition of a Penitent was a bar to Orders, the convert found himself, from this point of view, rendered incapable. It was this incapacity that the African bishops were seeking to remove.

latter had only treated them as they had themselves treated the supporters of Maximian.

In addition to these measures of the Council, each bishop was required to take in his neighbourhood all the steps likely to establish if not an *entente*, at any rate overtures and discussions of some kind. Augustine devoted himself to this task. Hardly had he been installed at Hippo when he composed a sort of ballad in *vers libres* summing up the whole of the anti-Donatist argument. It had a refrain—

Omnes qui gaudetis de pace
Modo verum iudicate.

The Catholic children sang it in the streets and thus rendered familiar the policy of union. If some Donatist bishop seemed less bigoted than the rest, Augustine seized opportunities of meeting him, or at any rate of writing to him, and endeavoured to pave the way for discussion. If he found a Donatist book in circulation, he made haste to refute it.[1] Petilian, Bishop of Constantina, one of the wise-heads of the party, for some time conducted the controversy with him. It was a controversy of an extremely monotonous character. On either side the same ideas, the same arguments of principle and of fact were served up endlessly. Augustine handled them with an unwearying patience, perfect dexterity, and above all, imperturbable good temper. In particular he made great play with the advantage afforded him by the quite recent story of the supporters of Maximian. It was he no doubt who had suggested to the Council of Carthage the idea of making the use of this that it did.

But neither controversies nor the intervention of the magistrates seem to have produced very appreciable results. At its meeting in 403 (August 25) the Council resolved on a more direct procedure and to invite the Donatists to a conference at which the two bodies of bishops might discuss the questions which divided them and set themselves to find a solution.

It was undoubtedly a good idea, but in order to call the Donatists to a meeting, it would have been necessary to be

[1] *Contra epistolam Parmeniani*, *De baptismo contra Donatistas*, *Contra litteras Petiliani*, *De unitate Ecclesiae*, *Contra Cresconium grammaticum*, *De unico baptismo* ; *cf.* the works lost but enumerated in the *Retractationes*, i. 21 ; ii. 5, 19, 27, 28, 29, 35 ; and the Letters relating to these matters.

able to approach them, and this was very difficult to do in view of the horror that they had of any kind of intercourse with the Catholics. With these irreconcilable folk all direct communication was impossible: recourse was had to the mediation of the municipal councils. Each bishop presented himself before the local magistrates, furnished with a letter from the Proconsul or the Vicarius. He secured the insertion of this letter in the minutes of the municipality and with it a form of exhortation and invitation to a meeting. This done and the Catholic bishop having retired, the formal record was read by the magistrate to the heads of the Donatist clergy. A formal record of their replies was similarly drawn up.

The officials lent themselves to this curious form of mediation: it achieved no further result. We still possess[1] a few phrases of the reply which was entered, in the name of Primianus, in the municipal registers of Carthage: "It would be shameful for the sons of the Martyrs to assemble themselves together with the race of the Traditors. . . . They brandish against us letters of the Emperor; on our side we have only the Gospels. . . . The true Church is the Church which endures persecution, not that which persecutes." They had not changed since Donatus—not even in style. The bishops of Numidia met together to deliberate, and their deliberation ended in a collective refusal.

As for the Donatist proletariat its anger was kindled, and in many places it gave itself up to terrible acts of violence against persons and against churches. The Circumcellions had perfected their equipment: the bludgeons of former days had been supplemented or replaced by slings, lances, and swords; they had even adopted a plan of throwing quicklime and vinegar at people's heads with the object of blinding them. The countryside in Numidia was in their power, and even in the towns there was risk of danger. Augustine, who was a special mark for their rage, was tracked by them on the roads; they spoke of killing him like a wild beast. His friend Possidius, Bishop of Calama (Guelma), was besieged in a farm, stripped, insulted, and beaten.

The Catholic Bishop of Bagaï, against whom they had a special grudge, was seized in a church, stricken down with broken pieces of the altar to which he clung, riddled with

[1] Aug. *Ad Donatistas post coll.* i. 31.

wounds and left for dead, so that his own people came to bury him. At this moment the Donatists perceived that he was still breathing: they dragged him to the top of a tower, and after further ill-treatment threw him down from it. Happily he fell on to a heap of litter; he was found again, tended with care and finally recovered.

Pushed to extremity, the Catholic episcopate called to mind the existence of laws against the supporters of schism, and that in fine this whole Donatist Church represented an unlimited infringement of them. At the Council of 404 (June 16) it was decided to send two delegates to the Emperor with written instructions, the text of which we still possess. The bishops demanded in the first place protection for the Catholics against the violent acts of the dissidents; secondly, the application, not to all the Donatists but to those who by their acts of violence should give ground for complaint, of the law of Theodosius,[1] by which persons who in the heretical sects confer or receive ordination, are liable to a penalty of ten pounds of gold, without prejudice to the confiscation of the places in which the ceremony took place; finally, the application also of the law which deprived heretics of the right of receiving gifts or legacies.

It would have been too rigorous a proceeding if the persons affected had been peaceful heretics; but in view of the temper of the Donatists and the excesses which they allowed themselves under the eyes of not unfavourable officials, it was not severe enough. So at any rate thought a number of the bishops; but the Council had adopted the view of Augustine, who was always inclined to lenient measures. It was in vain that they cited to him the good effects obtained in more than one quarter, notably at Thagaste, his native place, by a somewhat rigorous enforcement of the *Compelle intrare*. The people of Thagaste, who had been brought back to the Church in the days of Macarius, had not left it since. Augustine held firm: no one, according to him, ought to be forced to enter the Church.

In the course of these proceedings and whilst the envoys of the Council were sailing for Italy, an intervention took place on which neither Augustine nor Aurelius had calculated. The Bishop of Bagaï, only half healed, went straight to the Court,

[1] *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 21 (June 15, 392).

to show his scars and tell the tale of his adventures. He was not the only one: others besides him were wearying of being brutally assaulted under the mask of toleration. The impression produced was profound and decisive. A law was immediately despatched to Africa, ordering the suppression of the Donatist sect, the exile of their bishops and their assistants.[1] This involved the closing of the dissenting churches and their restoration to the Catholic clergy. It was an enforced union like that in 347, in the days of Macarius. Other laws speedily followed, dealing with various details.[2]

The imperial decree was at once put into execution at Carthage, and it would seem without any great difficulty. The plenary Council, held on August 23, according to custom, took note of the fact and passed a vote of thanks to the Emperor; it also decided that the officials should be requested to apply the law in the provinces with the same zeal as they had shown in the metropolis.

It is impossible to deny that the application of official pressure entailed serious consequences. The fanaticism of the Circumcellions was not the act of all the Donatists. There were not wanting among them men of intelligence who recognized the foolishness of their schism and were only seeking for a pretext to detach themselves from it. Many were Donatists by force of habit, by family tradition, without knowing why, without even thinking seriously about it; others were retained in the sect only by the terror inspired in them by the violent members. On the whole, the intervention of the State tended much less to disturb their consciences than to deliver them from an intolerable oppression.[3]

[1] The law is lost, but it is presupposed by laws of a slightly later date (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 38; xvi. 11, 2), and summarized by Augustine *Ep.* 185, § 26: "Lex fuerat promulgata, ut . . . haeresis Donatistarum . . . non tantum violenta esse sed omnino esse non sineretur impune; non tamen supplicio capitali, propter servandam etiam circa indignos mansuetudinem christianam, sed pecuniariis damnis propositis et in episcopos vel ministros eorum exilio constituto."

[2] *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 37, 38; xvi. 6, 3, 4, 5, all belonging to February 12, 405; xvi. 5, 39 (December 8). The first orders the posting everywhere of the Rescript obtained from Julian by the Donatists, with the Acta wherein the hatefulness of this concession was shown. Cf. *Const. Sirm.* 12, and *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 40, 41, 43.

[3] Aug. *Ep.* 185, §§ 29, 30; *Ep.* 93.

However, in many quarters resistance was offered, and the Catholics in spite of all the imperial edicts continued to be maltreated. A year after the Law of Union, the clergy of Hippo were reduced to making an appeal to the Donatist episcopate for protection against unendurable acts of violence.[1] At Bagaï the Donatists burnt the Catholic church[2]; at Constantina, at Sitifis, and in a number of places similar acts are reported; a Donatist bishop boasted of having, to his own account alone, destroyed four Catholic churches. We can readily understand that in these broils, and the acts of repression to which they gave rise, a certain number of Donatists were left on the field. However, reprisals were not pushed very far; the dissenting clergy were not deported.

Some years passed, years prolific in disasters for the Western Empire: the assassination of Stilicho (August 23, 408), the campaigns of Alaric in Italy, the pretensions of Attalus, the various sieges of Rome, and finally the capture and sack of the old metropolis of the world (August 24, 410). These events made themselves heard in the discords of Africa. Count Bathanarius having been assassinated shortly after his brother-in-law Stilicho, the Donatists thought themselves saved; but the position of guardian and favourite fell to Olympius, the Master of the Offices, an official of great piety, the friend of St Augustine: the earlier laws were confirmed in express terms.[3] However, in the following year, Olympius having been replaced by the pagan Jovius, an edict of toleration was obtained.[4] All the work accomplished in the course of five years found itself threatened.

The Council of Africa did not give way to despair. Already in 408, immediately after the fall of Stilicho, it had sent envoys to the Emperor. Fresh delegates set out for Italy, and on August 25, 410, whilst Alaric was entering Rome, there was handed to them at Ravenna a new edict[5] by which matters were restored to their former footing.

In the midst of these crises the idea of a conference between

[1] Aug. *Ep.* 88; cf. *Ep.* 86. The high official to whom this last letter is addressed, Cæcilian, may well have been a special commissioner sent to Africa to superintend the execution of the Law of Union.

[2] Aug. *Brev. Coll.* iii. 23; Coll. i. 133, 139, 189.

[3] *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 44, 46.

[4] *Cod. can. Eccl. Afric.*, c. 108.

[5] *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 51.

the two bodies of bishops was several times brought forward again. It suggested itself to all the men of sense on either side. The Catholics had made an attempt, in 403, to bring it about: the Donatists had rejected it; but in 406 some of them finding themselves at Ravenna had asked[1] the Prætorian Prefect to arrange a conference for them with a Catholic bishop who was paying a visit to the Court. The latter, not having any instructions for this, was obliged to hold aloof. However when, in 410, Aurelius' Council sent to ask for the recall of the measures of toleration inaugurated in the previous year, it instructed its delegates to request at the same time the assembling of a conference. To this Honorius consented. By a decree dated October 14,[2] he appointed Marcellinus, tribune and notary, one of the high officials of his Chancery, to make the preparations for this meeting, and to preside over it, and delegated to him the most ample powers.

Marcellinus came to Africa. He began by a study of the position; and then (in February 411) he published the imperial rescript with an edict in explanation.[3] There is a marked difference of tone between the two documents. The Emperor adopts the strictly legal attitude, and treats the Donatists as dissenters; the Commissioner, on his part, endeavours to hold the balance even between the two parties. He orders the provincial and municipal magistrates to put themselves into communication with the bishops, and to summon all of them to Carthage. No constraint is to be exercised; but the Donatist prelates are to know that, if they agree to come to the conference, the churches from which they have been driven out will be immediately restored to them, with their property; that a safe-conduct will be granted to them both in going and returning; and finally, that if they distrust the arbitrator by reason of his being a Catholic, they can provide him with an assessor of their own faith.

The Donatist bishops accepted the conference: they came to Carthage; they even made, on May 18, 411, a collective and solemn entry.[4] The Catholics arrived in their turn. When everyone was assembled, Marcellinus fixed the day and the place of the meeting. It was to open on June 1 in the Baths of Gargilius, a spacious and airy building, situated in the middle

[1] Act of Jan. 30, Coll. iii. 141. [2] Coll. i. 4. [3] Coll. i. 5-10.
[4] Coll. i. 14; *cf.* Aug. *Post Coll.* 25.

of the town. All the bishops were not admitted to take part there: it was feared that if they assembled in too great numbers they would not be able to hold a discussion without disorder. Each side was to choose seven speakers, to whom were to be joined seven counsellors without the right of speaking, and four commissioners who were deputed to watch over the making of the minutes of proceedings. These minutes were to be drawn up by the record-clerks of the principal government offices in Carthage, with the aid of two ecclesiastical notaries on either side. No speech, no interruption, no single word could be uttered without the speaker certifying its tenour on the transcript *en clair*, after it had been checked by the short-hand notes. Each of the two bodies of bishops was to notify the High Commissioner, before the opening of the conference, of their acceptance of the rules of procedure.

On the appointed day Marcellinus and the officials of the Chancery took their place in the great hall of the Baths: the bishops were ushered in. The Catholics numbered eighteen, according to the prescribed rule. Their orators were Aurelius, Augustine, two of Augustine's intimate friends—Alypius of Thagaste and Possidius of Calama, and then the Bishops of Constantina, Sicca, and Culusi. As for the Donatists, they presented themselves *en masse*. They, too, had already chosen their orators, but they were unwilling to name them at the outset: they were Primianus of Carthage, Petilian of Constantina, Emeritus of Cæsarea in Mauritania, Gaudentius of Thamugad, and three others.

Never would they consent to sit down, no matter what effort the Commissioner made to induce them: the righteous, they said, could not sit with sinners. Seeing this, Marcellinus resolved to remain standing, and the Catholic delegates did the same. So they remained until the evening, for a space of eleven hours, and it was the same on the other days.

From the very outset the Donatists defined their attitude. What they wanted was to hinder the discussion by entangling it in inextricable subtleties, or obstructing it by useless speeches. Their two principal orators, Emeritus and Petilian, distinguished themselves, the one by a pretentious and woolly loquacity which would have wearied the patience of an angel, the other by his vehemence, his passion, his pitiless logic, and his obstinacy which prevented him from yielding any-

thing whatsoever, and led him into endless repetition of the same objections.[1]

The first day was employed, or rather wasted, in debating incredible niceties of procedure. However, they succeeded in reading, first the Imperial Rescript and the Commissioner's edict, and then the reply of each of the two parties. The Donatists in theirs declared that they insisted on appearing in a body in order that no one should suppose that they were few in number. The Catholics accepted the edict unconditionally. Further they gave, formally and of their own motion, the following undertaking: that should their opponents be able to establish that their Church was the sole representative of all that remained of Christianity, they would descend from their episcopal thrones and place themselves under the authority of their colleagues. In the event of the debate resulting in their own favour, each of them would admit his Donatist colleague to share with himself the dignity of the episcopate and the government of his Church.

Finally, there was read the mandate which the Catholic delegates had received from their colleagues who were present at Carthage but were absent from the conference. This document was of a somewhat elaborate character: it contained a citation of all the texts of Scripture on which the Catholics based the theory of their position, and a reference to all the evidences in favour of the contention that the question of fact had been settled once for all in the days of Constantine. It bore the signatures of all the Catholic bishops present at Carthage. The Donatists fell at once on these signatures, claiming to verify them one by one. For this purpose they demanded the appearance of the signatories. This whim was conceded to them. All the Catholic bishops were summoned to the meeting place. Each of them answered to the call of his name, and then his Donatist colleague stated that he identified him. There were 266 Catholic bishops: we can judge of the time that was lost in this formality.

Then the Donatists consented to present their delegates and the text of the mandate which they had given them. The signatures were also read: they were made to be confirmed by

[1] P. Monceaux has reconstructed the list of his literary works ("Les ouvrages de Petilianus" in the *Revue de Philologie*, vol. xxxi. [1907], p. 218).

their authors; there were 279 of them; some of the signatures were disputed.[1]

Night had come; the continuation of the debate was adjourned to the next day but one (June 3). At the second session the Donatists, after various quibbles, asked for a fresh postponement. It was only on June 8 that the conference was resumed. There was a renewal of obstruction. The Donatists insisted flatly on knowing which of themselves or their opponents was plaintiff, which defendant. A great deal of time was lost over that. In the course of the discussion the dissidents produced a document which had been framed by themselves during the previous days as a reply to the mandate of the Catholics. Augustine, who on the first two days had hardly opened his mouth, proceeded to speak and set himself to sustain the debate on this document. In this he succeeded, though the Donatists, dismayed at seeing the matter dealt with in earnest, made countless attempts to rush off into details. They were forced to endure the production of Biblical arguments for the conclusion that the Church was not founded as a tiny society of saints, but as one which must include, until the final Judgement, all men whatever their character—sinners mingled with the righteous. In these circumstances, whatever might be the character of Cæcilian and Felix and the other persons in question, their culpability, if there were any, affected only themselves and did not prevent the Church being the Church. They passed next to the question of fact: what was actually the case as to the accusations brought against Cæcilian? The documents on which the defence of the Catholics had been based since the days of Constantine were read and discussed, together with those which the Donatists thought that they could set against them: these were few in number and calculated rather to tell against themselves. It was conclusively shown that Cæcilian and Felix had undergone various trials which had left nothing

[1] On the Catholic side, to the 266 signatories of the mandate there arrived 20 belated additions: there were 120 absentees and 64 sees vacant. This gives a total of 470 bishoprics. On the Donatist side the figures are not so precise; but allowing for absences, for vacancies, which were very numerous since the Law of Union (405), and for the fact that in many places the Donatist bishop had joined the official church, one would arrive at a total which was very nearly the same.

standing of the accusations against them, and that such had been the definitive judgement of Constantine.

The Commissioner then pronounced the discussion closed and bade the bishops withdraw while he drew up his decision. Night had fallen. It was by the light of candles that, on the return of the delegates to session, Marcellinus delivered his judgement, which was in favour of the Catholics on all points. On June 26[1] he published an edict, this time no longer in the capacity of judge but as charged to give effect to the result of the arbitration. In it he invited the Donatists to enter into union and take advantage of the generous offers made to them by their opponents—offers which the latter intended to fulfil. Otherwise, they must give up the churches which had been temporarily restored to them and abstain from any kind of schismatical gathering. The municipal councils, landowners, administrators or stewards, were warned not to allow any meeting of this sort on their estates. In the event of the law, which had so often been broken, being violated again, severe measures of repression were indicated.

The Donatist leaders appealed from the decision to the Emperor. The response was a law,[2] dated January 30, 412, which visited them with pecuniary penalties and inflicted on clergy who were recalcitrant the punishment of deportation from Africa.

The Count of Africa since 409 had been Heraclian, the murderer of Stilicho. During the attempted usurpation of Attalus he remained faithful to Honorius. When the Goths, after the death of Alaric (412), transferred themselves to Gaul, Heraclian quarrelled with the government at Ravenna, revolted and ended by landing in Italy with an army. Defeated at Otriculum by Count Marinus he fled to Carthage, but was overtaken and executed (July 413): Marinus, his conqueror, succeeded him. A very strong reaction followed. The friends of Heraclian found themselves under a cloud, and among their number were Marcellinus, the arbitrator at the Conference, and his brother the former Proconsul, Apringius. The two latter

[1] This document is usually printed at the end of the record of the Conference under the erroneous title of "Sententia cognitoris" (Aug. *Opera*, tom. xi., p. 1418). Its date by itself—not to speak of its contents—is at variance with this description.

[2] *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 52.

were the objects of the enmity of an influential personage, Cæcilian, a former Prætorian Prefect. They were arrested, to the deep despair of the bishops and especially of Augustine, whose close friend Marcellinus was, while all of them were grateful to him for his services to the Church of Africa. Cæcilian gave them fair words and even encouraged them to address themselves to the Court. They did so, and their delegates returned with the order for the liberation of the accused. But Marinus had anticipated them: some days before, after a summary trial, he had executed his prisoners (September 13, 413).[1]

It was a crushing blow for the Catholics. For a short time the Donatists triumphed. But Marinus was speedily deprived, and new rescripts arrived to confirm the decisions of the Government with regard to the schismatics.[2] Another Commissioner, Dulcitius, was appointed to superintend their application.

The work of union which had been begun in 405 progressed steadily. Whilst the magistrates, under the direction of Marcellinus and Dulcitius, were taking measures in their own domain, the widest publicity was given to the Acts of the Conference. From the outset they had been posted up at Carthage: complete copies of them were distributed.[3] In some places they were read in church during Lent. But their length soon necessitated abridged editions. One of these is still extant, the *Breviculus collationis*,[4] from the hand of St Augustine.

[1] On this business see Aug. *Ep.* 151.

[2] *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 54, dated June 17, 414—a confirmation of the measures of repression; *ibid.* 55, belonging to the following August 30—a confirmation of the official character of the records of the conference.

[3] The text had come down to us in a 9th century MS. which originally belonged to Lyons Cathedral (*Parisin.* 1546). It opens with a preface in which a certain Marcellus, *memorialis*, who had been adviser of the arbitrator Marcellinus, explains that he has thought it advisable to divide it into sections, and to collect in a table of contents the titles of all the sections which thus form, as it were, an abridgement of the whole text. For the first two sessions our information is complete, text and table having been preserved; but for the third—the most important—we possess no more than the table and the first 281 sections out of 587. From No. 282 onwards we must content ourselves with the table or have recourse to the *Breviculus* of St Augustine.

[4] Aug. *Opera*, tom. ix, p. 613. St Augustine says that the Donatists who had done everything they could to hinder the conference, and then

In yet other forms, in controversial works, local addresses, sermons, and letters, the bishops used every effort to set forth the truth and bring it to the knowledge of the Donatist public.[1] The war of controversy lasted long, but in the end common sense gained the day, if not everywhere, at any rate with the majority. The plenary Councils of 407 and 418 legislated on the division of the converted parishes. St Augustine in his discourses and in his correspondence bears testimony to the success encountered by the work of union. Two curious incidents call for mention.

In 418 Augustine and some of his colleagues happened to find themselves at Cæsarea in Mauritania, when they were informed that the former Donatist bishop, Emeritus, was there. At the Conference Emeritus had been the principal orator, or, as he might more properly be called, the principal obstructionist of his party. He was a man of culture and endowed with a remarkable facility of language. His flock had almost all of them passed over to the Catholic Church; some, however, remained doggedly in schism, through attachment to their bishop.

The latter, though officially proscribed, went about his business in freedom. Augustine met him in the public square, and they greeted each other. Emeritus even allowed himself to be led to the church where the discussion continued in the presence of the people who were highly interested, as we can imagine, by the meeting of the two great champions. There was not one session only but two.[2] However, Augustine was unsuccessful in his efforts to draw into debate the man who at the Conference had had so ready and so subtle a tongue. All that could be extracted from him was a protest against the use that the Catholics were making of the Conference: "The Acts," he said, "show whether I was conquered or conqueror; whether I was conquered by the truth or overwhelmed by force." Then he subsided into silence. At this

to prevent their business being dealt with, had succeeded by giving cause for an endless series of minutes in preventing anyone reading what had taken place.

[1] Letter of the Council of Numidia to the Donatists (Aug. *Ep.* 141); St Augustine *Ad Donatistas, post collationem* (*Opera*, tom. ix., p. 651); a letter to Emeritus—not extant (*Retractationes*, ii. 46).

[2] The formal records are extant: Aug. *Sermo ad Cæsareensis ecclesiæ plebem* and *De Gestis cum Emerito* (*Opera*, tom. ix., pp. 689, 697).

meeting he lost a few more adherents, but he was not otherwise disturbed.

In the following year another case presented itself—one which gives a very fair idea of the fanaticism which prevailed among the vanquished Donatists. The Commissioner Dulcitius had presented himself at Thamugad with the purpose of carrying out the Edict of Union. Thamugad, like Bagaï, was one of the strongholds of Donatism. Situated in the middle of the district round Mount Aurasius, in the true home of the Circumcellions, it could not fail to offer a special resistance. Its bishop, Gaudentius, proscribed in the eyes of the law but in fact unhampered in his coming and going, dwelt in the suburbs. At the news of the promulgation, which had been facilitated by his absence, he made haste to appear again, and, surrounded by determined fanatics, shut himself up in the church. From thence he sent word to the Commissioner that if any intention were shewn of advancing on the building, he would set it on fire and burn himself with all his people. The Donatists, and more particularly the Circumcellions, did not shrink, as was known, either from precipices or from any mode of suicide. In the latter days the stake had been very much in fashion in this curious world. But one could hardly expect such a proceeding on the part of Gaudentius, a man of education and one of the orators of his party at the famous Conference.

The Commissioner, dismayed at this attitude, communicated to the Bishop of Hippo the two letters in which Gaudentius informed him of his resolve. We still possess them in the detailed refutation which St Augustine devoted to them. To this refutation Gaudentius replied and Augustine answered him. This is the subject of his two books, *Contra Gaudentium*, a controversy of no humdrum kind between a peace-loving bishop and an infuriated fanatic who had taken up his position at the stake and was holding in his hand the fuse that would fire it. However, I am obliged to say that the discussion does not convey the impression of these tragical circumstances, and that on either side the everlasting arguments of this conflict are set out and hashed up again with the utmost calmness.

The documents do not tell us the conclusion of these stories. We should find it impossible to say whether or no Emeritus remained a Donatist to his last breath, or even if Gaudentius ended by setting light to his stake. One thing is certain,

namely, that Donatism, though exhibiting a progressive decline still retained a measure of vitality.

Twenty years after the Conference the Vandals became, masters of Africa, and the laws of the Roman Empire ceased to coerce the remnant of the fanatics. We still find some of them in Numidia down to the time of St Gregory the Great and to the eve of the Arab invasion.

CHAPTER V

ALARIC

THE Roman Empire did not die in a moment. From the time of the terrible crisis witnessed by the contemporaries of the Emperor Decius down to the day when Mahomet II. entered as conqueror into St Sophia, there stretches step by step a long series of partial catastrophes. One of the darkest hours in this mournful story is the beginning of the 5th century. It was then that the Latin frontier was broken on all sides, that the Western Empire was reduced to nothing, that the sanctuary of Rome was violated, and that the bewildered Christians mourned over the Babylon of the Seven Hills as Jeremiah had wept over Jerusalem: *Facta est quasi vidua domina gentium! Princeps provinciarum facta est sub tributo!*

And it was a pitiful fall. A few legions of bygone days, commanded, I do not say by Scipio or by Cæsar but by a leader of moderate calibre, would have disposed without much difficulty of the disordered bands before whom trembled the subjects of Honorius. But within the borders of the ancient empire there was now to be found nothing but weakness. We look in vain for a focus of national energy, a centre of action and of military control. A few mandarins in solemn gradation around a seraglio, a collection of lay-figures busied in paltry intrigues or running after sordid gains—such was the character of the Court of Ravenna. The recruiting of the army, greatly reduced by the general depopulation, still brought to it some conscripts, furnished by the landed estates; but it produced but little fruit except amongst the barbarian immigrants who had been introduced and planted more or less peaceably on the soil of the Empire in the neighbourhood of the frontiers. The Germanic element, half-Romanized, took a predominant part in the defence of its territory. Now that the aristocracy held aloof from the army, the command was often entrusted to men

who in origin were barbarians. They attained to the highest rank, to the most important positions. The *Fasti consulares* of the 4th century are filled with barbarian names such as Bauto, Merobaudes, Ricomer, or Arbogast. Now these personages were officers of the Roman service: they owed their promotion in no way to the position which they or their families might have enjoyed in their Germanic nation, but simply and solely to the services rendered by themselves to the Emperor, to advancement in the official hierarchy. The soldiers whom they commanded, whatever the race from which they came, were armed after the Roman fashion and enrolled in the ancient Roman corps. The time came when the authorities had to deal with Germanic hosts of one sort or another, massed either in tribal regiments or as hordes of adventurers, commanded by their national leaders. Such was the case of the Goths—whether those of the East under Gainas and Trebigild, or those of the West under Alaric. Such was also the case with the Franks, the Alamanni, and the Burgundians, when, despite all the victories of Julian, Valentinian, and Gratian, the attempt was abandoned to keep them beyond the Rhine. To these latter, at any rate, we can only attribute the progressive invasion of the provinces situated within their reach or further transitory expeditions into the interior of Gaul. From the lower Rhine and the lower Meuse the Franks, thenceforward established at Cologne and as far as Tongres, descended little by little towards the south. From the middle Rhine the Alamanni often crossed the Jura and the Vosges. A slow invasion or a hasty foray, but always in their own immediate neighbourhood, such were their exploits—witnessed without much power of opposing them. They did not launch out on distant expeditions, and they did not seek to play great parts in the politics of the Empire.

Alaric had more extensive projects. Circumstances had given him the position of leader of the Goths who were established in Illyricum: it was in that capacity that he had commanded the advance-guard of Theodosius at the Battle of the Frigidus. In that encounter he had been not a little unlucky. On the death of Theodosius, Stilicho sent him back to Illyria and then endeavoured to get rid of him, without succeeding in doing more than driving him into Greece, where he ravaged Athens and Corinth. The government of Arcadius

sought to impede the operations of the Regent of the West. It went so far on this course as to confer on the barbarian chief the rank of Magister Militum, with pay for his host. For some years Alaric remained quiet. Towards the end of 401 [1] we find him making his way towards Italy, crossing the Julian Alps and investing Aquileia. For the first time since the Cimbri and the Teutons the soil of Italy was desecrated by the invader. Rome trembled. Alaric gave vent to strange threatenings against it; the fortifications of Aurelian had to be put in a state of defence. Stilicho, however, succeeded in checking this first expedition. Vanquished at Pollentia (April 6, 402) and then at Verona, Alaric was obliged to evacuate Italy, and returned to his own Illyria.

This time they had got rid of him; but clearly for the future the leader of the Goths would have to be reckoned with. Stilicho formed a plan of making use of him in order to bring the southern provinces of Illyricum (Dacia, Macedonia, Greece) once more under the authority of the Emperor of the West. They entered into negotiations on the subject.

But it was really a question of conquests. Central Germania was setting itself in motion. Following Alaric's example, Radagaisus, another barbarian, descended from the Alps with an enormous host of at least 200,000 men (406). Once again Stilicho got the better of the invasion. The barbarians had advanced as far as Florence; he confined them to the hills of Fiesole, cut off supplies, and compelled them to surrender.[2] But at the same moment the frontier gave way at another point. On the last day of the year 406 three peoples of further Germania—the Suevi, the Alans, and the Vandals—sweeping aside the Franks who bordered on the Rhine, crossed the river and poured into Gaul. The cities on the banks—Mayence,

[1] As to this date and the next, see the discussion by O. Seeck in the *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, vol. xxiv., p. 175 ff.

[2] An arch of triumph, now destroyed, was erected at Rome near the Bridge of Hadrian (Ponte di S. Angelo), with an inscription commemorating the victory of the Emperors: *quod Getarum nationem in omne aevum docuere extingui* (*Corpus Inscript. Lat.* vi. 1196; *cf.* Jordan-Hülsen, *Topogr.* I^3, p. 599; in line 1 read "Fiesole," instead of "Pollentia"). This monument on which was celebrated the decisive extermination of the Goths was still quite new when the victorious Alaric passed beneath it. Stilicho also, as a consequence of the same victory, received a statue in the Forum (*C. I. L.* vi. 31, 987).

Worms, Spires, Strasbourg—were carried away by the torrent, and then the principal towns of Belgica. The scourge reached out still further, and in the two following years, 407 and 408, the whole of Gaul from the Rhine to the Pyrenees was a prey to the barbarians.[1]

Amid this confusion a usurper landed from Britain, as Maximus had done in 383. The army of the island, being in rebellion against Honorius, appointed emperors of its own. The first two who were elected perished, being butchered by those who had acclaimed them: the third, Constantine (Constantine III.), succeeded in holding his position, crossed the Channel, and after various changes of fortune proceeded to install himself at Arles. This was a serious embarrassment for Stilicho, more especially since Alaric, who was tired of waiting in Illyria, was once more assuming a threatening attitude. The Regent, whose reputation, in spite of the services he had rendered, was beginning to suffer from Court intrigues, did not abandon his ambitious schemes. He proposed to despatch Alaric to Gaul against Constantine whilst he himself marched on the Bosphorus, where the death of Arcadius and the extreme youth of his son, Theodosius II., made it possible for the Empire to fall on the distaff side. These projects were thwart by a catastrophe. The husband of Serena, the niece of Theodosius, twice father-in-law of the Emperor Honorius, to whom he had given in succession his daughters Maria and Thermantia, guardian and protector of the Empire of the West, Stilicho had been carried too high by the tide of fortune. He was credited with the supreme ambition, not for himself but for his son Eucherius, for whom it was said he destined the Empire of the East. Again, had he only been a Roman! But his Vandal descent was not forgotten; his alliances with Alaric shocked certain sentimental prejudices. Was the Empire to be governed and defended by barbarians? In a military rising his chief friends were massacred: then came his own turn. It was in vain that he sought refuge in a church at Ravenna; they succeeded in getting him out of it, and he was put to death by order of the Emperor (August 23, 408). His son Eucherius, who was arrested at Rome, by a similar violation of religious asylum, met with the same fate. The reaction

[1] Jerome, *Ep.* cxxiii. 16.

against the Barbarians was so strong that in their garrisons the Roman soldiers massacred the wives and children of the Germanic auxiliaries.

These were useless atrocities! Alaric remained at the gates of Italy with his famished horde, demanding to be employed, or at any rate to be granted an official title and pay for his people. He was under urgent necessity of replacing the similar advantages which his friendship with Stilicho had caused him to lose in the East. Not seeing anything coming his way he crossed the Alps, and traversing a country which was destitute of defence, presented himself under the walls of Rome. Feeling there was very hostile to the Barbarians. The ill-starred Serena who had taken refuge in the city, found herself held responsible for the invasion: she was butchered. However, famine made itself felt, and the old metropolis of the world was glad to buy itself back at the price of gold (autumn 408). It would have been well content then that the Court should conclude some arrangement with the Goths. But the Court, secure among the marshes of Ravenna, held out and refused to treat. Alaric returned towards Rome. He did not enter it; with the complicity of the Senate he proclaimed as emperor the Prefect Attalus, a rhetor of some note, and from him he obtained what he desired.

In order to live in Italy, a land of desolation, it was necessary to hold the key of the granaries of Africa. Alaric and the Senate, to whom the necessaries of life were a consideration which dominated all else, wished to send the Goths there. Attalus, like Honorius, showed scruples: it was repugnant to him to entrust this mission to the Barbarians. As he took no step forward in any other direction, Alaric deposed him (410) and resumed his negotiations with Honorius. They came to nothing. For the third time the leader of the Goths marched on Rome. This time, after many days of terrible famine, the gates were opened to him on August 24, 410. Since the almost legendary days of the Gallic invasion the sanctuary of the Roman power had remained inviolate. This time it experienced the fire kindled by a victorious enemy, pillage, massacre, and every kind of horror. For three days Rome was delivered over to the starving horde, which the senseless government at Ravenna had not known

how to divert from it. Fortunately Alaric and his Goths were Christians: orders were given to kill as little as possible, and to allow full access to the hallowed asylum of the two sanctuaries of the Apostles. Both were outside the walls and had long been in the power of the besiegers. On their approach the precious vessels of the Basilica of St Peter had been hidden in the city. A Gothic soldier found them in the house of an old woman; and Alaric, on being informed of this, caused them to be carried back under an adequate escort to the tomb of the Apostle, whither they were followed by a number of Romans.[1]

At last, like the ebbing of a flood, the barbarians set out on the roads to the south, with their chariots filled with booty, and followed by a large number of prisoners. Among the latter figured Placidia, daughter of Theodosius, own sister of the Emperor Honorius. Across Campania and Lucania Alaric led his host as far as the Strait of Messina, which he proposed to cross in order to go to Sicily, and thence to Africa; but his transports had been sunk or scattered by an imperial fleet and he was obliged to retrace his steps. He was carried off by illness in the neighbourhood of Cosenza.

However, the usurper of Gaul, Constantine III., found himself just as much as Honorius in difficulties with barbarians and rivals. Spain, which had at first accepted him, speedily witnessed a hostile rising under the direction of two kinsmen of Theodosius—Didymus and Verenianus: after a few successes they fell into the hands of the Emperor of Arles and were put to death. But Gerontius, the general who had defeated them, revolted in his turn, and proclaimed a new emperor—Maximus. Confusion was at its height. The Barbarians who for two years had been roaming about Gaul succeeded in crossing the Pyrenees (409). At the same time Britain, which had been left to itself, separated itself from the Empire. To the north of the Loire the cities of Armorica did the same. Who would have dreamed that at such a moment Constantine could entertain the idea of conquering Italy, and substituting himself forthwith for the son of Theodosius? Yet that is what he attempted. He was to be seen crossing the Alps and advancing as far as Verona, whilst his son Constans,

[1] Orosius, *Hist.* vii. 39; *cf.* Sozomen, *H. E.* ix. 10.

whom he had associated with him in the Empire, confronted the difficulties in Spain. But the sources of information which he had at Ravenna suddenly failed him. At this moment Gerontius, taking the offensive, crossed the Pyrenees and reached Vienne when Constans fell into his power and was put to death. Constantine, who had returned to Gaul, was speedily besieged in Arles. His only hope lay in some contingents of barbarians, which an attempt was being made to raise for him beyond the Rhine. While he was waiting for these, an army arrived on the scene from Italy under the command of Constantius, a general of Honorius, an officer marked out for brilliant victories and a most exalted destiny. Constantius fell first upon the besiegers. Gerontius, deserted by his troops, fled to Spain. Constantius prosecuted the siege in his stead. When the expected reinforcements arrived, the forces of Honorius received them with vigour and put them to rout, and the unhappy Constantine found himself compelled to surrender. He took refuge in a church, where Heros, the bishop, as an additional safeguard, ordained him priest; but Constantius paid no heed to such proceedings, and making himself master of the person of the fallen Emperor, sent him to Honorius with his second son, Julian. They were executed before reaching Ravenna (summer 411).

Arles was in the hands of Honorius; but the end of the difficulties had not yet been reached. Even before the conclusion of the siege a new rival, Jovinus, had declared himself on the banks of the Rhine, and was supported by the Alamanni and the Burgundians. Meanwhile, Alaric's brother-in-law, Athaulf, who had been proclaimed King of the Goths, was wandering about Italy with his barbarians, for ever urging the same requirement—a command and bread—and offering in return to serve the Emperor and restore to him his sister Placidia. As no heed was paid to him, he passed over into Gaul (412) under the pretext of offering his services to Jovinus, established himself at Bordeaux and later at Narbonne, and after coming to a slightly better understanding with Honorius, relieved him of Sebastian, the brother of Jovinus, who had taken him as a partner in the Empire, and then of Jovinus himself (413). Finally, as they could not make up their minds at Ravenna to satisfy his demands, he decided to marry Placidia (January 414). Narbonne witnessed these curious

nuptials in which fifty young men in rich silken robes presented to the daughter of Theodosius the spoils of Old Rome, whilst the former emperor, Attalus, who had returned to literary pursuits, recited an Epithalamium. Athaulf, seated by the side of Placidia, wore the dress of a Roman, a symbol of the secret feelings of these honest Goths who wished no ill to the Empire, and asked no more than to defend it and even to become Romans themselves, provided they were given food. But their appetite was just the point in the game that the policy of Ravenna, which had no use for them, was seeking to profit by. Matters reached a state of still worse confusion, and Attalus became emperor once more, a few months after the marriage of Placidia. Whilst he was roaming about Aquitaine, Constantius, who was established at Arles, redoubled his efforts against the Goths, dislodged them from Narbonne, and finally drove them into Spain. Placidia, while these events were happening, gave birth to a son whom his father, who retained his attachment to the reigning dynasty, wished to call Theodosius. The child died after a few days and was buried at Barcelona: shortly afterwards Athaulf perished by assassination. A reaction set in: during the ephemeral reign of Sigeric, which lasted only seven days, Placidia was subjected to ill-usage. Wallia, who replaced Sigeric, at last came to terms with the Court of Ravenna. He was given a supply of corn, and pledged himself to fight against the other barbarians, who, since 409, were continually ravaging unhappy Spain. Placidia was given back, and shortly afterwards (on January 1, 417) married the General Constantius, the man of the hour, the Roman saviour of the Roman Empire. After having thus rewarded his lieutenant, Honorius came himself to celebrate a triumph at Rome (417). Attalus figured in the procession. At the moment when the Goths were crossing the Pyrenees, the unfortunate man had allowed himself to be captured by the forces of Constantius. Rome beheld the passing, behind the car of the son of Theodosius, of the ill-starred Emperor of Alaric and the Goths.[1] The old capital experienced a new birth after so many days of misfortune: its inhabitants

[1] Although at certain times he had shown himself extremely overbearing, he was granted his life. After two of his fingers had been cut off he was sent to the island of Lipari, where he ended his extraordinary career in peace.

returned to it from exile or from captivity: the damages caused by the invasion were repaired as well as circumstances allowed: men began again to live. Once more the House of Theodosius presided over the destinies of the West. Britain no doubt was lost; and on the Rhine, Franks, Burgundians, and Alamanni did more and more as they liked with the frontier; but the people of Armorica had returned to submission; except for Spain, where the barbarians squabbled among themselves, Peace, the Pax Romana, reigned once more.

At the time when the Germanic peoples were so cruelly ill-using the Empire of the West, the Church there was leading a life of comparative tranquillity. The Priscillianist agitation was gradually confining itself to the distant province of Galicia: the Episcopal dissensions which had followed it, in Gaul and in Spain, were tending to sink to rest. Paganism was dying everywhere, officially proscribed in relation to its outward manifestations, and no longer defending itself except in the heart of the country districts and in certain aristocratic circles. The Christ reigned now without a rival over the Court and over the towns: a complete conquest was nigh at hand: it was only a matter of a small number of years.

It was just there—in this definite success—that there lay the germ of certain internal difficulties. Everyone was becoming a convert: that was well, but to what? To another form of worship, or to another kind of life? Was it only a matter of substituting Christ for Jupiter, the Eucharistic Liturgy for the ancient sacrifices, Baptism for the Taurobolium, and in other respects living as in the past, according to conventional ethics and the custom of the world? Many, we must frankly admit, went no further. Among the clergy themselves there were not wanting persons who interpreted the Gospel after this fashion. Others raised protests against such an enervation and demanded of Christians a complete break with the spirit of the age. Neither passages of Holy Writ nor memories of bygone days were wanting in support of their contention: they cited the examples of the monks of the East and of their Western disciples, Melania, Paula, Jerome, and the rest; they pointed to the figure nearer home of Martin, the monk-bishop, whose miraculous life was the boast of the whole of Gaul. It was the eternal struggle between

laxity and severity! Ausonius and St Martin had lived at the same time, in the same country: each was a Christian, but what a difference!

Between these two extremes there was room for a great variety of shades. The type of sanctity represented to us by men like Ambrose and Augustine differs markedly from that of the fathers of the desert, or even of bishops like St Martin. On the other hand it would have been easy to meet in the world, in public offices, even at Court, with Christians who betrayed rather more traces of their baptism than did the illustrious rhetor of Bordeaux. In a general way the conflict between the two ideas of the Christian life tended to the promotion of asceticism. We find it now exhibiting itself everywhere, with a quite novel intensity.

In Spain the Priscillianists had brought it into much disrepute. However it still continued, with its ancient forms and even its ancient abuses.[1] There were groups of holy women living and mortifying themselves together. It was from a convent of this sort, situated in the heart of Galicia,[2] that the Virgin Etheria (or Eucheria) set out to accomplish that long pilgrimage in the East of which she has left us so curious an account. The poet Prudentius presents to us another type, that of a man of the world who, on arriving at a certain point in his career, gives himself to reflection, to questioning his religious consciousness, then makes a sharp turn, renounces the world, converts himself—to use the Seventeenth-century phrase. We know the works in which he employed the leisure hours of his pious retirement, and how Christianity had in him its first great poet.

At the time that we have now reached, Christian literature which, in the Latin world, had lived for long on Tertullian and Cyprian, began to exhibit a certain brilliancy. In succession to Lactantius and St Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Sulpicius Severus discoursed of religion with considerable elegance of style. In regard to poetry matters were somewhat backward. A few attempts at hymns, proceeding from the pen of Hilary and of Ambrose, represented all that could be

[1] Council of Toledo, A.D. 400 (*Conc. Tolet. I.*) c. 6, 9, 16, 18, 19.

[2] Férotin (*Revue des Questions historiques*, vol. lxxiv. [1903], p. 387, note 2). The author of the Itinerary to which the name of Silvia was at first assigned.

mentioned.[1] With Prudentius the Church possessed a true poet, a kind of Pindar, whose sacred odes were for long centuries to give expression to the piety of the faithful. His Muse prays at the various hours of the Christian day; it celebrates the martyrs on their anniversaries, it wars against the heretics of the past or against the remaining representatives of Paganism. Cautiously restrained in his poetical inspiration, Prudentius avoids with care all burning questions. In his pages there is not the smallest trace of the Priscillianism which all around him was stirring the religious world. He does not even mention the Arians. In other respects also he was very much a man apart: his contemporaries do not seem to have noticed him. If he had not told us a little himself, in the preface that he wrote in 405 for the collection of his poems, we should have nothing to say about his personal history.

Paulinus, his contemporary, is known in a very different fashion. Sprung from a great family of Bordeaux, where he was born in 353, he had received in the famous schools of that town the lessons of Ausonius, with whom he was bound in ties of close friendship. Side by side with the career of letters, they each followed that of public offices and attained to the consulship, Ausonius late in life, Paulinus in his prime.[2] But soon their ways divided. Whilst the old littérateur, with a bare tincture of Christianity, dallied over worldly pursuits, formal discourses, and little trivial poems, Paulinus, at the bidding of the Voice within, set himself to abandon all this. Bishop Delphinus gave him baptism (390); it was soon reported that he was departing for Spain, and, in company with his wife Theresa, embracing a life of poverty and mortification. Having been ordained priest at Barcelona (Christmas 393), he set out in the following year for Italy. In the course of his official career he had been the *Consularis* of Campania; his attention had been attracted at that time by a local saint, a former priest of Nola named Felix, who had edified that town about the middle of the 3rd century. He determined

[1] I may be allowed to neglect here such inferior productions as those of Juvencus, who in the days of Constantine turned the Gospels into verse, of the poetess Proba, of Pope Damasus, of the anonymous writer against Marcion, etc.

[2] Ausonius was consul in 379, Paulinus shortly before him: he was therefore at most twenty-five at the time of his consulship.

to settle near his tomb and to promote his *cultus*. Paulinus and Theresa were known throughout the whole of the West: their "conversion" made a great sensation. People in Society were highly scandalized at it and gave vent to loud protests. Ausonius, wounded to the heart, made vain efforts to restrain his former pupil. St Ambrose, on the other hand, was delighted at it, as also were all the friends of asceticism—Martin, Augustine, Jerome, and the rest. Ambrose gave Paulinus a most hearty welcome at Milan. In Rome he met with some opposition among the clergy: Pope Siricius did not display any warmth in his treatment of him.[1] On his arrival at Nola, Paulinus made the requisite arrangements for his new mode of life, living with Theresa as brother and sister, following a régime of the most abstemious kind, and entirely devoted to the care of the poor and the cult of his beloved St Felix, to whom he dedicated every year a new poem. It was a time when the Court of Ravenna was filled with admiration of the fine verses of Claudian on official celebrations and the victories of Stilicho. From these literary pomps Paulinus, like Prudentius, turned away his eyes. It was not for them but for the glory of an obscure priest, dead for more than a century and neglected by everyone, that Ausonius had trained his most brilliant pupil. Paulinus escaped completely from his influence. The old master must have died about the time of his retirement, for he does not appear among the convert's correspondents. The latter wrote readily enough, but to other holy men like Sulpicius Severus, Delphinus, Amandus, Augustine, Rufinus, and Jerome. In his new style, which is saturated with Biblical reminiscences, echoes of secular antiquity are very infrequently heard. As kindly as Augustine and less worried than the Bishop of Hippo to take part in ecclesiastical affairs, he lived a peaceful life in his Campanian retreat, loved and revered by everyone and avoiding taking any side in disputes. His propaganda on behalf of St Felix was crowned with success. People flocked to Nola from all quarters of the West, from Gaul and Spain and Africa, and even from the regions of the Danube and from the East. But St Felix was plainly only an excuse: what attracted them was his two servants, Paulinus and Theresa, the living flowers of Christian virtue.

Among the foremost of the friends of Paulinus we find

[1] *Ep.* v. 13, 14, "urbici papae superba discretio."

Sulpicius Severus, like him a native of Aquitaine, and also a man of good family and ample fortune. Together they renounced the world. Sulpicius was a widower: the two friends formed a plan of being together again, and when Paulinus had established himself at Nola he tried every kind of persuasion to induce Sulpicius to come there too. But the latter was detained in Gaul by his devotion for Martin, whose acquaintance he made about 392 and who showed him from that time forward the greatest friendship. The still-living saint of Tours was for Sulpicius what Felix of Nola was for Paulinus. He constituted himself his biographer, and that without waiting until his career was ended. Martin was still alive when his *Life* was sent to Nola. Everyone knows the success of this remarkable book and of the supplements which the author gave it in his Letters and his Dialogues. We feel as we read these writings how utterly disgusted the author is, not only with the world but with the Church itself and especially with the clergy. It is to recall them to the Christian ideal from which men have so sadly fallen that he sets himself to depict the radiant figure of the holy bishop, so austere, so full of zeal and of charity, so potent in miracle and in edification. Sulpicius would that all bishops should be so many St Martins. It was not very easy of accomplishment, nor even perhaps greatly to be wished, for men of God of so marked a type are not always perfect administrators. Their vocation is to produce at a given moment a deep and effective impression. Before Martin Christianity hardly existed in the western regions of Gaul. His contagious fervour had caused apostles to multiply and their preaching to bear fruit. But already in his latter days there is to be seen developing around him a form of opposition to his methods. Britius, one of his disciples, advocates a less summary rule, a less intolerant austerity. And it is quite clear that his views found supporters, for it was he who was elected Martin's successor. Martin's strict disciples waged against him a war to the death: the whole of the writings of Sulpicius Severus bears reference to this controversy.[1] The resistance went further still. At Tours itself it was not long before Britius encountered a violent opposition which compelled him for a considerable time to remain at a distance from his Church.

[1] This history repeated itself in the 13th century in relation to St Francis and after him. Brother Elias is a copy of St Brice.

One of the principal figures in the ranks of his accusers is that of a certain Lazarus who pursued him from council to council, and notably before a council of the bishops of Northern Italy, assembled at Turin.[1] The views of Sulpicius Severus and of Lazarus had representatives in Provence: Proculus, Bishop of Marseilles, soon set Britius' accuser on the Episcopal throne of Aix; on that of Arles was seated Heros, another disciple of Martin. Politics in the end came to be concerned in this dispute: Heros, Lazarus, and Proculus committed themselves with the "usurper" Constantine III.; when the authority of Honorius was re-established in these districts, they had to pass through evil times.

Sulpicius assuredly goes too far in his bitter statements. There were, in his time and in his own country, a number of good bishops, men like Delphinus and Amandus of Bordeaux, Exuperius of Toulouse, Simplicius of Vienne, Alithius of Cahors, Diogenianus of Albi, Dynamius of Angoulême, Venerandus of Auvergne, Pegasius of Périgueux, Victricius of Rouen, friends and correspondents of Paulinus of Nola or favourably mentioned by him.[2] St Jerome was acquainted with some of them[3]: he highly extols the worth of Exuperius of Toulouse. Victricius of Rouen, a friend of St Martin, had come like him from the ranks of the army.[4] On becoming a bishop, he had distinguished himself by his zeal, not only in his diocese but in far distant regions such as the land of the Morini and the seaboard of the Nervii,[5] countries which had scarcely been evangelized and whither he went to preach the Faith, and to establish Christian settlements. The bishops of the island of Britain begged him (*c.* 395) to come over to them to settle some disputes, and he did so successfully. However, he found critics of his teaching, and it was no doubt on this account that he made the journey to Rome. Shortly after his return,

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 330, 331. The date of the Council of Turin remains uncertain, somewhere about the year 400.

[2] See his Letters 10, 14, 19, 20, 35, to Delphinus (cf. *Carm.* xix., l. 154); 10, 12, 15, 21, 36, to Amandus; 33, to Alethius; 18, 37, to Victricius. *Cf.* Fragment 48 preserved in Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* ii. 13.

[3] Letter 55 *ad Amandum;* as to Exuperius, *Epp.* 123 (c. 16), 125 (c. 20), and the preface of his Commentary on Zechariah, which he dedicated to him; on Alethius, *Ep.* 121.

[4] Paulinus, *Ep.* 18, c. 7, tells the story with some admixture of legend.

[5] Corresponding very nearly to the present Flanders.

Pope Innocent sent him (404) at his request a little book of canonical rules which has found a place among the Decretals.[1] Exuperius also addressed himself to Rome (405) for the elucidation of certain disciplinary problems, and received from the same Pope Innocent a formal opinion of a similar kind.

Victricius was known to Sulpicius Severus, who places in the lips of St Martin a remark which redounds greatly to his honour as well as to that of Valentinus, the Bishop of Chartres.[2] And does he not himself say[3] of Felix of Trèves that he was a man of great holiness and truly worthy to be a bishop?

Unfortunately, the ordination of this holy man, which had taken place in the middle of the Ithacian crisis,[4] had been the starting-point of a schism among the bishops of Gaul: fifteen years at least elapsed without a reconciliation being arrived at. The case was carried before the Council of Turin to which we have already referred. But the Italian prelates were bound by the decisions of St Ambrose and of Pope Siricius: they could but uphold these and advise the abandonment of Felix. Only the death of the latter could allay this discord.

It will be seen that the whole of the Episcopate was not in need of conversion, and that if the wry temper of Sulpicius Severus discovered so many points in it for criticism, the kindly Paulinus on his part succeeded in deriving edification.

Sulpicius lived in retirement near Toulouse, surrounded by a few disciples who made expeditions from time to time, either for the requirements of his correspondence with Nola, or to visit the holy places and the holy persons of the East. Postumianus, one of their number, made a long journey in Egypt and the Holy Land: at Alexandria he witnessed the quarrel between Theophilus and his monks; at Bethlehem he was filled with admiration both of St Jerome and of his *entourage*. In his "Dialogues" Sulpicius Severus assigns to Postumianus a *rôle* of considerable importance: in fact, it was by his means that he was able to enforce the idea which was very dear to his heart, that, whatever might be said of the illustrious solitaries of Egypt, Martin was superior to them in all respects. Another of his disciples, Vigilantius, had also

[1] Of Victricius we possess a homily entitled *De laude sanctorum*, composed on the occasion of the arrival of some relics (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* tom. xx., p. 443).

[2] *Dial.* iii. 2. [3] *Ibid.* iii. 13. [4] Vol. II., p. 425.

made, a few years before, the journey to Nola[1] and that to Palestine. He was a somewhat restless spirit. At Bethlehem he conceived the unhappy idea of engaging in a dispute with Jerome. The latter was then in a state of passionate indignation against Rufinus: it was the very time when he himself had just abandoned Origen and allied himself with the campaign of Epiphanius against the Bishop of Jerusalem. The moment was ill-chosen for interference and especially for making observations, as Vigilantius did, on the Origenist past of the irascible Doctor. However, they parted almost peaceably.[2] But soon Jerome learnt that Vigilantius was criticizing him in Gaul.[3] He wrote him a letter in his best ink. On a later occasion still, he had to devote his attention to him and no longer in reference to Origen. Vigilantius, who was already a priest at the time of his journey in Palestine (396), had returned to his own country, the city of the *Convenae*,[4] where he had some position among the clergy. He seems to have changed ground, for the ideas which before very long were attributed to him, bear small trace of his relations with Severus and Paulinus. He showed himself now strongly opposed to the *cultus* of relics, or rather, as it seems to me, to certain exaggerations of this *cultus*. He did not approve of the wasting of candles, the multiplication of nocturnal vigils, which, in his eyes, were a danger to morality. Finally he held that it was wrong to leave the world for solitude. The proof that his statements had nothing very heinous about them is the fact that he enjoyed the favour of the bishops of his district. All this would have passed without notice, had not some priests who were neighbours of Vigilantius, and did not share his views, denounced them to Jerome. Jerome was a man who cherished resentment long, and he rushed headlong upon the opportunity. In two successive writings, he abandoned himself to expressions of the most extraordinary violence against the rash man who had presumed to find motes in his orthodoxy.[5] Bishops who shared Vigilantius' opinions he treated as

[1] Paulinus, *Ep.* v. 11.

[2] Jerome, *Ep.* 58.

[3] Jerome, *Ep.* 61 ; *cf.* Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.* i. 9, where Jerome is defended against certain imputations : "Qui eum haereticum esse arbitrantur, insani sunt."

[4] Later the diocese of Saint-Bertrand de Comminges ; *cf.* my *Fastes épisc. de l'ancienne Gaule*, vol. ii., p. 3.

[5] *Ep.* 109 *ad Riparium presb.* ; *Contra Vigilantium.*

unworthy of the title; they are the kind of people, he said, who would like only to ordain deacons who were married.[1] This detail, which must have a foundation of some sort, proves at any rate that the law of ecclesiastical celibacy had not as yet, in the south of Gaul, the full extension that it received later.

These invectives of Jerome have done the greatest wrong to the reputation of Vigilantius: from the next generation onwards he passed as a heretic. At bottom we need see in this controversy only a manifestation of the feelings of repugnance excited by the exaggerations of the popular worship. Jerome himself was compelled to recognize that everything is not unquestionably correct in devotions used without consideration by simpletons and women.[2] There are some things which he upholds rather than approves. On the whole no question of principle is here involved, and if Jerome had not had old scores to settle with Vigilantius, we may well believe that he would have left him in peace.

Such was the condition of people's minds, in Spain and in Gaul, on the eve of the great invasion. In the Danube provinces, Rhætia, Noricum, the Pannonias, Mœsias and Dacias, it was no longer simply the eve: the Goths and other Germanic peoples possessed a sufficient number of settlements and sufficient influence there to make it possible to ask, in many places, whether they were not the real masters of the country.

In these regions in which Arianism had achieved so great a success it still lingered, but only in the heart of the barbarian colonies. There was no longer any place in the ranks of the official clergy for Arian bishops. In the time of Gratian and of Theodosius, Auxentius of Dorostorum had been compelled to take refuge at the Court of the Empress Justina, who was still an Arian. Later still we find among the Goths of Thrace a bishop named Selenas,[3] who seems to

[1] According to Jerome, *Contra Vigil.* 2, these bishops had required of intending deacons a proof of their capacity for wedlock. This is a piece of invective. We infer merely that certain bishops sometimes preferred, for the diaconate, candidates who were married to candidates who were celibate, but of whose celibacy there was small guarantee.

[2] "Quod si aliqui per imperitiam et simplicitatem saecularium hominum vel certe religiosarum feminarum, de quibus vere possumus dicere, "Confiteor, zelum Dei habent, sed non secundum scientiam," hoc pro honore martyrum faciunt, quid inde perdis?" (*Contra Vigil.* 7).

[3] Socrates, *H. E.* v. 23; Sozomen, *H. E.* vii. 16.

have been the successor of Ulfilas. Alaric had one in his army—Sigisharius; he baptized Attalus in 409, and made an effort, but in vain, after the assassination of Athaulf, to save from massacre the children of that unfortunate prince.[1] Maximin, the same, no doubt, as he who about 383 had engaged in a conflict against St Ambrose,[2] became a bishop; in 427 we find him landing at Carthage with Count Sigisvult and a corps of Gothic auxiliaries. He was a learned man, of ready speech, and an ardent controversialist. Immediately on his arrival he made enquiries as to Augustine, and presented himself at Hippo to hold debate with the great Doctor of the West. In the midst of his controversies against the Donatists, the Manicheans and the Pelagians, Augustine had found time to meditate on the mystery of the Trinity. He had even written upon the subject a considerable work, his *De Trinitate*, the fruit of the labour of fifteen years. But it was a study of a purely theoretical type, a composition of the library, elaborated without reference to anything save the data of tradition and the exigencies or conventions of Reason. Arians in flesh and blood were very rare in Africa: Augustine had scarcely seen one since his stay at Milan at the time of his conversion. It was a new experience[3] for him to find himself engaged in public and formal debate with a convinced Arian, with a bishop who was also a theologian, as well equipped as himself in regard to the Biblical material for this controversy, making use of words with facility and of disputation with dexterity. We still possess the formal record of the encounter[4] in which, thanks to the volubility of Maximin, the aged Bishop of Hippo was not able to marshal all his resources. Hence he

[1] Olympiodorus in Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 80, p. 60.

[2] Vol. II., p. 452, note 2. This involves, however, a very long career: we should perhaps divide it between the two Maximins.

[3] The Count Pascentius, with whom he had a discussion in 406 (*Epp.* 238-241), was not a serious opponent. A dozen years later Augustine refuted in writing an Arian sermon which had been sent to him (*Opera*, tom. viii. *Contra sermonem Arianorum*). About the same time he had occasion to write to a certain Helpidius, an Arian, who had an idea of converting him, and had even transmitted to him a treatise by a bishop of his sect (*Ep.* 242). Finally by the aid of Alypius he converted a physician of the town of Thenæ in Byzacena: this physician, who was called Maximus, seems to have been a Eunomian who had strayed to Africa (*Epp.* 170, 171).

[4] *Collatio cum Maximino Arianorum episcopo* in the eighth volume of St Augustine's works.

thought it his duty to take up the subject again in a special treatise[1]; Maximin, who had been informed of the intention of his antagonist, had promised a reply, the text of which has not been preserved. However, he must speedily have left Africa with Sigisvult and his Goths. Some years afterwards we come across him again in Sicily, where he drew on himself a formal condemnation from the bishops of that country. He took his revenge when Genseric invaded Sicily (440) by advising the Vandal king to persecute.[2]

Auxentius and Maximin were undoubtedly not the only leaders of their sect who were capable of controversial writing.[3] Hence we cannot attribute to either the one or the other with complete certainty some Latin fragments of Arian literature which have been recovered in some very ancient Bobbio MSS.,[4] and which must be added, as specimens of Danubian theology, to the famous commentary on St Matthew, known in the Middle Ages under the name of St John Chrysostom.[5]

It fairly often happens that in these books the polemic is directed not only against the orthodox (Homoousians) and the Macedonians (Homoiousians) but also against the Photinians. The former Bishop of Sirmium, just as Arius had done, had retained disciples in the Illyrian provinces, and even elsewhere.[6]

At the Council of Capua (391) the question was raised of

[1] *Contra Maximinum haereticum Arianorum episcopum* (*Ibid.*).

[2] Hydatius, *Chronicle*, an. 440.

[3] We may note the writing by an Arian bishop mentioned in St Augustine's letter to Helpidius (*Ep.* 242) and the two "Doctors," Bonosus and Jason, to whom Helpidius refers him. This Bonosus is certainly a different person from the one we are about to deal with.

[4] Published by Cardinal Mai, *Scriptorum Veterum nova collectio*, tom. iii.², p. 191 ff. (= Migne, *P. L.* tom. xiii., p. 593 ff.). We may rule out altogether Fragments 21 and 22, which belong to the *Ascensio Isaiae*. The remainder comprises a homiletical commentary on St Luke, and extracts from various polemical discourses. *Cf.* Mercati, *Studi e Testi*, fasc. 7, p. 47.

[5] This is the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* (Migne, *Patr. Graec.* tom. lvi., p. 611). St Thomas Aquinas held it in high esteem, so much so that between this book and the town of Paris he would, he said, have chosen the book.

[6] A letter of Pope Innocent (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 318) speaks of a Photinian named Mark who, when driven from Rome, had gone to conduct propaganda in the diocese of Sienna.

Bonosus, the Bishop of Naissus (Nisch),[1] and his inaccurate teaching. The Council referred the complaints to the Bishop of Thessalonica and his brethren of Illyria. These began by suspending Bonosus from his Episcopal functions, and then, as he did not come to a wiser mind, deposed him altogether. He resisted and organized a schism. What exactly was his doctrine? The different papal letters in which his case is dealt with[2] do not give us complete information. In one of them, written by Pope Siricius at a time when the suit brought against Bonosus had not yet been decided, we see that, like Helvidius and Jovinian,[3] the Bishop of Naissus maintained that Mary had had children by Joseph after the birth of the Saviour. But it seems an established fact[4] that he did not stop there but put into circulation again the doctrine of the Christ having become Son of God by adoption—a doctrine already condemned in the cases of Theodotus, Paul of Samosata, and Photinus. This theology travelled like Arianism in the baggage of the Goths when they set out on their march towards the West. From the latter part of the 5th century down to the 7th the ecclesiastical documents of Gaul and Spain make fairly frequent mention of heretics who are called Bonosiaci

[1] Others say of Sardica. They base themselves on a passage of Marius Mercator (Migne, *P. L.* tom. xlviii., p. 928), but it is only an *obiter dictum* and one by an author whose accuracy is often at fault. Pope Innocent (Jaffé, 299), in his letter to Marcian, the Bishop of Naissus (Coustant, *Epp. Rom. Pont.*, p. 820), clearly supposes that Bonosus had been, before Marcian, bishop of this place. Coustant in vain adduces the argument that Bonosus had conducted many irregular ordinations: these irregularities only took place after he had made a schism, whilst the ordinations at Naissus go back to his Catholic period.

[2] Siricius (Jaffé, 261); Innocent (*Ibid.* 299, 303), the latter belonging to December 14, 414.

[3] Vol. II., pp. 383, 443.

[4] This is the view taken by Marius Mercator (*supra*, p. 123, note 1). Gennadius, *De viris*, 14 (cf. *De Eccl. Dogm.* 52) mentions a Bishop Audentius who seems to have refuted Photinianism, perhaps already under the name of Bonosianism, which Gennadius himself employs. On the Bonosiaci see the collection entitled "The Second Council of Arles," c. 17; Avitus of Vienne, *Contra Arianos* 19, *Contra Eutych. haer.* 2; Council of Orléans of 538, c. 34 (31); Council of Clichy of 627, c. 5; Justinian, Bishop of Valentia in Spain, according to Isidore *De viris*, 33 (*cf.* Isidore himself, *Etym.* viii. 5; *De Haeres.*, 53); *Decretum Gelasianum* 10 (Thiel, *Epp. Rom. Pont.*, p. 470); Vigilius, Jaffé *Regesta* 931 and 932; Gregory the Great, Jaffé *op. cit.* 1844. On this subject see the article "Bonosus" by Loofs in Hauck's *Encyclopädie*.

and are identified with the followers of Photinus. In the country in which it arose the schism of Bonosus occupied the attention of the ecclesiastical authorities for some time, and gave rise to debates on the value of the ordinations conferred by the heresiarch.[1]

This dispute is hardly known to us except from the correspondence of the Popes. Illyricum, Eastern and Western alike, was considered at that date as belonging more especially to their jurisdiction. At the time when the see of Constantinople, at length delivered up to orthodoxy, was beginning to become an important centre of ecclesiastical relations, Pope Damasus felt the need to strengthen the ties, somewhat slight ones hitherto, which attached to his see the provinces lying between Italy and Thrace. Those of the North and West—Noricum, Pannonia, and Dalmatia[2]—had not ceased to belong to the Empire of the West. With the exception of Dalmatia they were not slow to fall as a matter of fact into the hands of the barbarians. The remnants of their ecclesiastical organization were grouped more or less around Aquileia as the metropolis. Dalmatia better secured against invasions, remained or returned within the orbit of Rome. It would seem likely that in the reign of the Emperor Constantius, the Bishop of Salona, the metropolis, inspired some measure of confidence in the Arianizing party, for the "Eastern" Council of Sardica sent to him its circular letter.[3] This bishop was named Maximus. In the days of the Emperor Gratian his see was occupied by a certain Leontius who, for some reason that we do not know, was deposed by Ambrose and the bishops of Upper Italy but restored by Pope Damasus. On the strength of this last decision he presented himself at the Council of Aquileia, which upheld his deposition but without in any way coming into conflict with the Pope. Damasus was shown, I imagine, that Leontius was less innocent than he had supposed.[4]

[1] See the Papal Letters cited, p. 123, note 2.

[2] Together they constitute the "Diocese" of the Pannonias and represent seven provinces—Noricum by the river bank (*ripense*), Inner Noricum (*mediterraneum*), Pannonia Prima, Pannonia Secunda, Valeria, Savia, Dalmatia.

[3] Vol. II., p. 173.

[4] Our knowledge of this business is derived solely from what Maximin says of it (ed. Kauffmann, p. 87).

Forty years later[1] a letter of Pope Zosimus to Hesychius of Salona, in regard to the usurpation of ecclesiastical functions by the monks, shows us the metropolitan of Dalmatia anxious to protect himself with the authority of the Holy See. These relations subsisted down to the Avaro-Slav invasion at the end of the 6th century.

The other provinces of Illyricum situated to the east of Dalmatia and of the Adriatic formed, in their civil aspect, two "Dioceses," those of Dacia and Macedonia. This division corresponded in the main to the distribution of languages, Latin being the prevailing language in the "Diocese" of Dacia, Greek in that of Macedonia.[2] The latter extended southward to the extremity of the Peloponnese and even included the Cyclades and Crete. Sardica seems to have been the capital of the first "Diocese," as Thessalonica was that of the second.

After the catastrophe of Valens (378) these provinces had been entrusted to Theodosius by the Emperor Gratian: the operations against the Goths required that the whole Balkan peninsula should be subject to the same military command. After the death of Theodosius they remained to the Empire of the East, despite the efforts of Stilicho to recover them. But the former connexions held firm in the ecclesiastical domain. The Popes were more fortunate than Stilicho. We have scarcely any information in regard to these churches, and especially as to their relations with the Holy See before the closing years of the 4th century. However, it follows from Councils held in 381 at Constantinople and at Aquileia[3] that the bishops of Eastern Illyricum attached themselves to the episcopal body of the West. Pope Siricius took that as his basis in delegating his powers to the one of their number who was best qualified by the importance[4] and the position of his see—the Bishop of

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 339 (February 21, 418).

[2] Provinces of the "Diocese" of Dacia: Mœsia Superior, capital *Viminacium*; Dacia Ripensis, *Ratiaria*; Dacia Mediterranea, *Sardica*; Dardania, *Scupi*; Prævalitana, *Scodra*. Provinces of the "Diocese" of Macedonia: Macedonia, *Thessalonica*; Thessaly, *Larissa*; Epirus Nova, *Dyrrachium*; Epirus Vetus, *Nicopolis*; Achaia, *Corinth*; Crete, *Gortyna*.

[3] Vol. II., pp. 375-6.

[4] The Council of Sardica (c. 20) recognizes the importance of Thessalonica: *Non ignoratis quanta et qualis sit Thessalonicensium civitas.*

Thessalonica.[1] Already Acholius, the head of that church, had been charged in 381 by Pope Damasus with the task of opposing at Constantinople the election of Gregory Nazianzen.[2] His successor Anysius, who was elected in 383, received from Siricius letters containing a definite delegation: these letters were renewed to him by Anastasius and Innocent.[3]

For such a system to yield appreciable results it would have been necessary in the first place that it should correspond to the traditions of the country, and secondly that it should have the support of the Emperor of the East. But on the one hand the bishops of Illyricum were in no wise accustomed to recognize as their head the metropolitan of Thessalonica; on the other hand, it was scarcely to be hoped that the Eastern Emperor, often at variance with his colleague of the West, would consent to uphold, against his own subjects, a jurisdiction which emanated from an ecclesiastical power which he did not hold under his own control. Besides, the Bishop of Constantinople was at hand to suggest to him an attitude of disfavour. Hence the delicate organization conceived by the mind of Pope Siricius had considerable difficulty in working.

However, the "Vicariate" of Thessalonica was one thing: quite another was the traditional orientation in the direction not of the New but of the Old Rome. This orientation continued: in particular, we often find in the Papal Letters the

[1] Before Acholius we know, in the 4th century, of the following bishops: *Alexander*, who was present at the Councils of Nicæa and of Tyre; at the latter he undertook the defence of Athanasius; *Aetius*, his successor, who had to triumph over two rivals, with the sequel that his Church was divided by schism (Council of Sardica, c. 18, 19, in the Greek); his contemporary, Protogenes of Sardica, did not love him and sharply criticized his morals: of this, however, nothing appeared at the Council: it was perhaps only an Arian slander (Hil., *Frag.* iii. 20); *Heremius*, who came after Aetius and figured at first among the defenders of Athanasius but in the end abandoned him (Athanasius, *Apol. ad Const.*).

[2] Vol. II., p. 346. It is this which justifies the mention of Acholius and of Damasus in the letter of Pope Innocent (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 300). That it was Siricius who began the practice follows from the letter (Jaffé, *op. cit.* 404) of Pope Leo (Migne, *P. L.*, tom. liv., p. 616), [*Siricius*] *qui . . . Anysio certa tum primum ratione commisit.*

[3] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 257,* 259 (Siricius); 275* (Anastasius); 285 (Innocent).

Pope dealing directly with points of dispute[1] referred to him from Illyria.[2]

Relations in the same sense but of a different character are represented by the journeys to Rome of Bishop Nicetas. This prelate, whose personality has been recovered by the learning of our own day, was Bishop of *Remesiana*, a little place situated to the east of Naissus, in the same province of *Dacia mediterranea*. He made the journey to Italy on two occasions, in 398 and in 402; each time he made a stay at Nola, where he received from Paulinus the warmest of welcomes. In 402 he met Melania in his house. Nicetas was a holy man, of great missionary zeal and some literary ability. It seems likely that there is ground for attributing to him the composition of the *Te Deum*. If so, this famous hymn which the whole of Latin Christendom chants in hours of deep emotion must have first resounded in a forgotten corner of the ancient Mœsia.[3] It is the fairest relic of the churches which flourished there in Roman times. Nicetas[4] saw them engaged in conflict with Germanic barbarism and Arian heresy. Yet they held their ground. It was only two centuries later that another barbarism overwhelmed them completely—the barbarism of the pagan Slavs. The latter was much more difficult of assimilation: it was only effected after protracted efforts.

In Upper Italy men lived long on the tradition of Ambrose. His episcopal see was first occupied by the aged Simplicianus,

[1] The affair of Bonosus and the clergy ordained by him (Jaffé, *op. cit.* 261, 299, 303); of the Bishop Photinus, condemned by Pope Anastasius on false evidence, restored by Innocent (*ibid.* 303); of the Deacon Eustathius, whom Innocent refused to condemn (*ibid.*); of the Cretans Bubalius and Taurianus condemned by him (*ibid.* 304). We have here clearly only samples which have survived the loss of the papal correspondence.

[2] On the Vicariate, see my memoir "L'Illyricum ecclésiastique" in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (1892), reprinted in my *Églises séparées*, c. vi.

[3] The portion of *Dacia mediterranea* in which are situated Naissus (Nisch) and Remesiana (Ak Palanka) had been torn from the ancient province of *Mœsia Superior*.

[4] On Nicetas see Paulinus, *Carm.* 17 and 27; *Ep.* xxix. 14; Gennadius *De viris*, 22. On the remnants of his writings recently recovered or identified, see the works noted by Schanz, *Gesch. der römischen Litteratur*, pp. 367 ff. We possess some didactic writings by him for the use of candidates for baptism, a letter to a married virgin (G. Morin, *Revue Bénédictine*, vol. xiv. [1897], p. 198), a treatise on Psalmody and another on Vigils (*ibid.* p. 390).

who had had a share in more than one famous conversion, notably those of Marius Victorinus, of Augustine, and of Ambrose himself.[1] In 401 he was replaced by Venerius, a former deacon of Ambrose, who some ten years later had as his successor a certain Marolus, who came from the distant banks of the Tigris. The Syrians at that time were widely scattered throughout the whole Empire; in the principal commercial centres they had colonies of merchants comparable to those of the Jews. This fact explains certain instances of the diffusion of doctrines and customs. At this time there was still much to be done in the valley of the Po for the spreading of the Gospel: it is not surprising that workers were accepted from any quarter.

Bishoprics were multiplying there. Towards the middle of the 4th century the episcopal jurisdiction of Milan still extended to west and north as far as the Alps: the famous Eusebius of Vercellæ was the first bishop of that see.[2] St Ambrose founded the Bishopric of Como[3]; Simplicianus that of Novara[4]; that of Turin, the jurisdiction of which long extended over a vast area, dates back to the same time.[5] Felix, Gaudentius, Maximus, head the lists of bishops for these dioceses. Maximus of Turin has left us an interesting collection of homilies. More ancient were the churches of Brescia and Verona. The first had had for its bishop, in the days of St Ambrose, a certain Philastrius who seems to have led at first a wandering and troubled life, always and everywhere at strife with pagans, Jews, and heretics. In 364 he had taken part at Milan in the tumults excited by St Hilary against Bishop Auxentius: in these he received some blows of which his back long bore the marks. After becoming Bishop of Brescia he continued to struggle against the heretics, but by less violent means. He has left us a catalogue of 156 heresies,[6] a work of a very unequal character, but derived from interesting sources. At Brescia he left a memory which was held in high esteem—an esteem which was fostered by his disciple and successor Gaudentius, a preacher of repute, of whom several

[1] Aug. *Conf.* viii. 5.

[2] *Corpus Inscript. Lat.* tom. v., No. 6722. [3] Ambrose, *Ep.* 4.

[4] Life of St Gaudentius of Novara, *Acta Sanctorum*, January 22.

[5] F. Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia*, pp. 283 ff.

[6] This catalogue was drawn up between 386 and 391.

discourses survive. At Verona, too, there were preserved the lucubrations—of a somewhat bizarre kind—of its bishop, Zeno. Trent, which was farther advanced into the Alps, was a centre of difficult missions[1] in which the Bishop Vigilius was actively engaged. According to a somewhat doubtful tradition, he would seem to have compassed his own death there.

The Bishop of Milan, as Bishop of the Imperial Court of the West, found himself led by circumstances to take, in ecclesiastical affairs, a position of preponderance analogous to that which, in the Eastern Empire, fell to the lot of his colleague of Constantinople. St Ambrose executes official acts, without hesitation as to his competence and without challenge, in the provinces of Venetia and Æmilia equally with that of Liguria, in which his episcopal city was situated.[2] However, Aquileia was a considerable town: its bishop also enjoyed as such special consideration. If the Eastern prelates had recourse, in some case of necessity, to the Italian episcopate, their letters were addressed, not only to the Pope and to the Bishop of Milan, but also to the Bishop of Aquileia. When the Emperor Honorius (c. 404) had transferred his residence to Ravenna, Milan, which had fallen from its rank as capital, lost some of its prestige in Northern Italy. It was at that time that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Aquileia was definitely fixed and that that of Ravenna, to which it was necessary also to assign its share, was organized. But it is very clear, from the most ancient documents that remain to us with regard to these boundaries, that they were fixed without regard to the delimitation of the civil provinces.[3]

[1] Vol. II., p. 512.

[2] At the Council of Sardica the bishops of Northern Italy—those of Verona, Aquileia, Ravenna, Brescia, and Milan—all describe themselves in their signatures as *ab Italia*, without mention of their provinces: on the other hand those of peninsular Italy expressly indicate them: *a Campania*, *a Tuscia*, *ab Apulia*.

[3] The jurisdiction of Milan, as attested by the Synodal Letter of 451 (*Leonis Magni Ep.* 97), comprised at that time Bergamo, Brescia, and Cremona, cities of which the last two at any rate belonged to the province of Venetia; then Piacenza, Reggio, and Brescello which were in Æmilia. On the side of Aquileia the boundaries continued: at the end of the 6th century the province of Aquileia did not extend beyond Verona. But Ravenna succeeded gradually in annexing to itself absolutely the whole of Æmilia, as far as and including Piacenza.

The new establishment of these metropolitical cities of the North limited to some extent the authority of the Pope over the churches of these regions. However they seem to have been set up peaceably enough[1]; the Pope allowed himself to be relieved of the immediate care of the bishoprics of the North, and confined his solicitude to peninsular and insular Italy. From Luni on the Tyrrhenian Sea and Ravenna on the Adriatic all the bishops held directly from him, without the intermediation of metropolitans. Even the Bishop of Ravenna[2] who exercised, in respect of his colleagues in Æmilia, metropolitical authority, was considered at Rome as a suffragan. The Pope examined the validity of his election and consecrated him himself. This was in fact the procedure adopted throughout the whole of the papal province for the control of nominations to bishoprics. Siricius laid down the principle that no consecration of a bishop ought to take place apart from the Apostolic See. His successors after him applied this rule with great strictness, and inculcated its observance in distant parts, substituting of course for the intervention of the Holy See that of the metropolitical or quasi-metropolitical authorities established in the particular regions.[3]

Christianity succeeded in achieving the conquest of Rome. The temples still standing, still adorned with fine statues and ornaments of bronze and of gold which they retained down to

[1] The Roman Council of 378 (Vol. II., p. 372) protests against a Bishop of Parma who defies a sentence of condemnation which he has incurred. But is it really of Parma that this recalcitrant was bishop? In his reply the Emperor Gratian would seem to say that his resistance challenges the responsibility of the Vicarius of Rome, who did not possess jurisdiction in Æmilia (*Coll. Avell.* No. 13; Coustant, *Epp. Rom. Pont.* pp. 526, 531; Tillemont, vol. viii., pp. 410 and 776). On the affair of Leontius of Salona, *vide supra*, p. 124.

[2] Ravenna, in its civil aspect, was outside the province over which it exercised its ecclesiastical jurisdiction. This was the position of Massilia (Marseilles) in relation to the province of Narbonensis Secunda. Cf. *infra*, Chap. VII.

[3] *Cf.* the Roman Council of 386, c. 1, "Ut extra conscientiam *sedis apostolicae* nemo audeat ordinare." In the Council of the province of Byzacena (Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. iv., p. 379), to which this decree was communicated, the words *sedis apostolicae* are explained by the gloss *hoc est primatis*, the primate or "dean" being in Africa the equivalent of the metropolitan in other countries. In the *Liber Regularum* sent by Pope Innocent to Victricius of Rouen (*supra*, p. 118), in place of *sedis apostolicae* we find *metropolitani episcopi*.

the time of the sack by Alaric, were closed by authority and abandoned by their worshippers. These might be seen thronging to the Lateran on the appointed days to receive baptism and the holy unction.[1] In Society pagans were still to be found: several of the personages whom Macrobius was soon to pourtray as engaged in discussion in his Saturnalia were contemporaries of Siricius and of Innocent. They became more and more rare. Doubtless there was no prohibition against being a pagan; but there was nothing to be gained by not being of the religion of the Emperor, and this consideration tended to undermine the strength of attachments. Those who held firm were, so far as can be judged, persons of substance whose virtues, both public and private, crowned with honour the end of the old religion. They stood comparison only too well with the Christians who claimed considerable latitude in their practice, with the great families in which baptism was customarily deferred till the death-bed, in which all the frivolities of the world and all the pursuits of luxury were reconciled with the Gospel, and scruples would have been felt at abandoning the pursuit of high public appointments as a career. Such families were very numerous. To people like the Anicii Probi, whose luxurious mansion stretched along the Pincian Hill and whose mausoleum behind the apse of St Peter's rose to the proportions of a small basilica, Christianity was a light yoke. The clergy made small effort to render it heavier: these *grands seigneurs* were very liberal. They built churches and supported the various forms of ecclesiastical charity. But there were Christians of a different type. On the Aventine Marcella continued without interruption her life of austerity in company with her ward Principia. At the foot of the Cælian, near the temple of Claudius, dwelt the senator Pammachius with his wife Paulina, the daughter of Paula the famous friend of Jerome, and the house of these godly people was the meeting-place of many others who likewise took Christianity seriously. Among the number was the Marcellinus who in 410 had been sent to Africa to bring about the reunion of the Donatists with the Catholics; besides him, the priests Domnio and Oceanus, both of them correspondents of Jerome; Rufinus, a Syrian priest who had settled in Rome; the British monk, Pelagius; the matron Fabiola, renowned

[1] Prudentius, *Contra Symmachum*, I. l. 587.

throughout the whole city of Rome for her penitence and her charity. This great lady, who was one of the descendants of Fabius Maximus, had married again after a divorce occasioned by the irregular life of her first husband. After the death of her second she was seen in the Lateran basilica amid the celebrations of Easter, taking her place in the ranks of penitent sinners and submitting herself to all the severities of the penitential discipline. At the end of her penance she sold her property and devoted herself to the relief of the monks and the poor. For these she founded in Rome a hospital for the sick, the first to be seen there. At Portus also she desired to establish a Home for the poor travellers brought to that place by the course of their sea voyage. She made an agreement with Pammachius and the foundation was established at their joint charges.[1] In 395 Oceanus took her to the Holy Land: she would have remained there, but the dread of the Huns who were said to be on the point of invading Palestine brought her back to Italy. There she had found war kindled between Jerome and Rufinus; like Oceanus she inclined rather to the side of Jerome from whom she derived learned explanations in regard to the difficulties of the Bible.[2] When she died, in 399, he wrote her funeral oration.[3]

On the Cælian, too, but higher up and not very far from the Lateran, rose the magnificent mansion of the Valerii Maximi. It was from there that Melania had set out, in 372, when she fled from Rome and the world for exile in the Holy Places. The child whom she had left behind, Valerius Publicola, had grown up and married; his wife Albina was daughter of Cæionius Albinus, one of the most distinguished remaining representatives of Paganism. She was a Christian, like her husband, but not specially given to austerity. Her sister Laeta had married Toxotius, own son of St Paula, and so found herself the sister-in-law of Pammachius. The old Pontifex Albinus had become the founder of a line of Christians; perched on their grandfather's knees his granddaughters sang to him their Alleluia. These were Paula, the daughter of Laeta, and Melania, the daughter of Albina, both of them

[1] De Rossi, *Bull.* (1866), p. 99. [2] *Epp.* 64, 78.

[3] *Ep.* 77. He had already written those of Blæsilla (*Ep.* 39), of Nepotianus, nephew of his friend Heliodorus of Altinum (*Ep.* 60), and of Paulina, the wife of Pammachius (*Ep.* 66).

destined to follow in the steps of their two grandmothers and to die like them on the far-off soil of Palestine.

Jerome took a keen interest in the posterity of the venerable Paula, who had died before his eyes in 404. He sent to Laeta a complete course of education[1] for the little Paula, offering to carry it out himself, in conjunction with Eustochium, if they would consent to send the child to him. Melania on her side, in her convent at Jerusalem, kept a watchful eye over her family. Publicola, her son, good Christian[2] as he was, said nothing about renouncing the world, in which he was detained among other ties by the care of an enormous fortune. Her granddaughter Melania[3] had married, though it is true against her inclination, for she would have preferred to follow in her grandmother's footsteps. But that was four or five years ago: her first two children having died one after the other, the young wife returned to her plans of devotion and did her best thenceforward to win for them the support of her husband Pinianus, who was a scion of another branch of the Gens Valeria—the Valerii Severi. Such dispositions presented, in the eyes of the austere matron, possibilities of cultivation; and besides there still remained in the family several members who lingered in paganism. Melania made up her mind that her presence might be of service.

In the spring of 402 she was to be seen landing at Naples, severe in attire, always *grande dame*, always a little formidable. Her family was waiting for her on the shore, and without delay escorted her to Nola. The party represented the flower of Roman aristocracy: the good Paulinus gave them all hospitality, and then they set out on their journey to Rome.

[1] *Ep.* 107.

[2] See his correspondence with St Augustine in regard to certain "Cases of Conscience" raised by the administration of his African properties, at any rate those which involved contact with the pagan barbarians of the Libyan frontier. (Aug. *Epp.* 46, 47.)

[3] On St Melania the Younger, and even on the Elder, and also on the whole Roman world of this time, see the important work of Cardinal Rampolla, *Santa Melania giuniore* (Rome, 1905); *cf.* Goyau, *Sainte Mélanie* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1908). Cardinal Rampolla has published the Latin and Greek texts (on their relation *cf.* Adhémar d'Alès in *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. xxv., p. 401 ff.) which remain to us of a life of Melania the Younger, written by her close friend the priest Gerontius, and has accompanied them by full and learned dissertations on all the points of interest.

Among the reasons which induced Melania to undertake this expedition must be reckoned, I suspect, a desire to come to the aid of Rufinus, her director, who had found himself for some time in an awkward position. However, the death of Pope Anastasius (December 19, 401), of which she had doubtless not received the news before her departure from Palestine, smoothed away the most serious of the difficulties. Innocent, the new Pope, a man like Siricius of a peace-loving temperament, showed himself like Siricius little disposed to espouse the quarrels of Jerome and his friends. Rufinus returned from Aquileia to Rome. It is probable that he established himself in the house of Publicola on the Cælian Hill: from this time forward we find him constantly with this family.

Melania caused a sensation in Rome. Times had greatly changed since her departure. Then, in the days of Valentinian, people were living in comparative prosperity, and above all in complete security. The barbarians were on the other side of the Danube; the frontier of the river was strongly guarded. Now the Goths, almost masters of Illyricum, were crossing the Alps, overrunning Italy, and threatening Rome. To Melania it represented the approach of the end. What availed it to linger among the vanities of the world? But Stilicho succeeded in that same year (402) in ridding Italy of the hordes of Alaric. Men began to live again, and the patrician dame was a preacher in the wilderness. However, she succeeded in converting the Senator Apronianus, husband of her niece Avita, and in company with his whole household he adopted the practice of the strictest religious observance. Pinianus and the younger Melania gave themselves up to it more and more; but the objections of Publicola had still to be reckoned with. He held his ground to the end against his mother's reproaches, and only sanctioned on his death-bed (404) the plans of renunciation which were being formed by his daughter and his son-in-law. The aged matron had already set out on her return to Palestine, which she reached safely after a sojourn in Africa. She died some weeks after having set her convent in order (405).

The death of Publicola left the young couple's hands free. They took advantage of the fact to put in practice the precept of the Gospel, "Sell all that thou hast and give to the poor."

Their fortune was so large, their estates so extensive and so numerous in all parts of the Empire, that this renunciation caused enormous difficulties. Little by little they carried it out, thanks to the support of Serena, the wife of Stilicho. Retiring at first to a villa in the suburbs, very probably the same as the famous villa of the Quintilii, of which the striking ruins are still to be seen at the fifth milestone on the Appian Way, they entertained there in 405 the Greek bishops on the side of Chrysostom, who had been driven from their country by persecution.[1] Rufinus was with them. In 408, at the moment when, Stilicho being dead, Alaric was at hand to lay siege to Rome, they set out for the south, stayed for some time at Nola and then went to live in another of their villas, in Sicily, on the Strait of Messina. From there, no doubt, they purposed to proceed to the East, whither Rufinus was to accompany them. With them he stayed with Paulinus who loved and revered him: with them he crossed the Strait and took up his residence in the Sicilian villa.

While this was happening the mournful destinies of Old Rome were in process of accomplishment. Pammachius died shortly before the last siege.[2] Marcella was to be a witness of its horrors; when the Goths became masters of the city soldiers penetrated to her house. To make her deliver up pretended treasures, they beat the illustrious and venerable matron with whips. So far as treasures were concerned, the most precious to her, the only one about which she was anxious, was the honour of Principia, her young companion. This was respected. The two women were taken to the church of St Paul and found protection in the Apostolic sanctuary. But the ordeal had been too severe: Marcella did not survive it.[3]

It was not Rome only that was ravaged. The Goths had speedily succeeded in reaching Campania. Paulinus, who had just been elected Bishop of Nola, had to put up with the discomfort of a visit. They pushed on further still, and

[1] *Supra*, pp. 72, 74.

[2] His house was converted into a church. Remains of it have been found under and in the buildings of the church of St John and St Paul.

[3] Jerome, *Ep.* cxxvii. 13, 14.

passing through Lucania and Bruttium reached the Strait of Messina. From the villa which sheltered them Rufinus and his friends witnessed the burning of Rhegium, and might well fear that the Strait would not protect them against the enemy. However the danger passed away from them. While those around him were congratulating themselves on the fact, Rufinus' last hours came. He died in the arms of Pinianus and Melania.

These terrible crises from which the old Empire emerged still more enfeebled do not seem, apart from this enfeeblement itself, to have had consequences of extreme seriousness. The principal achievement, the capture of Rome, did not represent the final disaster, the fall of the central redoubt of the Empire; it was a chance blow, the unmeditated exploit of a body of adventurers in search of supplies, a monstrous insult rather than a decisive overthrow. But Rome was so hallowed that the shock of this insult resounded far and wide. Groans were heard from one end of the world to the other. In his distant solitude, Jerome felt himself smitten to the earth.[1] It seemed to him that all was over, that the universe was swallowed up in darkness. The catastrophes of earlier days recalled themselves to his soul: mid his groans of anguish there jostle in confusion the names of Troy, of Moab, of Jerusalem, the verses of Vergil, the lamentations of Isaiah, and the imprecations of the Psalms. With the general disaster there were mingled for him personal sorrows: his two best friends, Pammachius and Marcella, had been taken from him, and many others with them. More numerous still were those who had fled before the scourge. Some of them reached Palestine: their pitiable condition engaged his charity and that of Eustochium. In Africa, too, refugees abounded: besides their miseries they carried thither their quarrels and their recriminations. "Behold," said the pagans, "behold the vengeance of the gods! Rome which they had so often saved had deserted their altars. In the hour of peril their succour had failed it."[2] Even among the Christians many avowed themselves

[1] *In Ezech.* i. and iii., pref.; *Ep.* cxxvii. 11-14.

[2] During one of the two sieges proposals had been made to re-open the temples and offer sacrifices: so we are told by Sozomen, *H. E.* ix. 6, and Zosimus, *H. E.* v. 41. Both of them seem to be based upon Olympiodorus (Photius, *Cod.* 80). Zosimus stands alone in giving the story of the

disturbed; it seemed to them that the true God now recognized at Rome owed it to Himself and to it to protect it. What had it gained by becoming Christian? What aid had been given to its defence by the Apostles and martyrs whose tombs surrounded its walls?

Augustine was greatly concerned at all these complaints. He attempted a reply in his sermons[1]; but the occasion of disturbance was felt beyond the circle of his hearers. He resolved to supply an antidote by a book dealing with the subject. This was the famous *City of God*. He worked at it for more than twelve years, publishing it in successive instalments. And even that did not content him. It seemed to him that the whole of history must be summoned to show that catastrophes like that of Rome had been much more frequent and more serious before Christianity than since it appeared. For this purpose he had recourse to the learning of others. A Spanish pupil, Orosius, whom circumstances had brought to him, was entrusted with the development of this thesis. He accomplished it in the seven books of his *History against the Pagans*, the contents of which exactly correspond to the title. The position adopted by Augustine and Orosius compelled them to minimize as much as possible the disaster of 410. Hence they speak of it with an optimism on which too much reliance must not be placed.

One thing is certain: Rome had suffered greatly. A number of dwellings, both of patricians and others, were in ashes; if the precious vessels of St Peter's had been spared, the churches of the city seem to have been systematically sacked.[2] The sea, the islands, the shores of Africa, of Egypt, and of Syria were covered with fugitives who told stories of lamentable

proposal addressed by the Prefect Pompeianus to Pope Innocent, who is represented as having promised to shut his eyes provided that everything was done secretly. Zosimus is a pagan: he writes nearly a century after the event, and the fact, unlikely in itself, would have been highly secret and difficult to verify. Anyhow the sacrifices did not take place.

[1] *Serm.* 81, 105, 296.

[2] The *Liber Pontificalis* relates that the ciborium of the Basilica of the Lateran had been carried off by the barbarians and was only replaced under Xystus III. Similarly Pope Celestine had to renew the sacred furniture of the Julian Basilica in Transtevere. These are isolated pieces of information: it is clear that all the churches were treated after the same fashion.

events and displayed to all the world misfortunes only too real.[1]

From this disaster at Rome, in regard to which we possess a certain amount of information, we can judge of the evils of the invasion in the provinces in which it raged at that time—that is to say, throughout the whole of the West with the exception of Africa, which still remained for a season immune. The country-sides, open villages, and rich villas were first of all overwhelmed: fortified towns were taken by famine, by treachery, sometimes by main force.[2] This was the occasion of an orgy of murder, pillage, and burning. Then the scourge was transferred elsewhere. The survivors recovered themselves, repaired as best they could anything that remained of their habitations, and resumed so far as it was possible their former life.

From a moral point of view these terrible lessons do not seem to have succeeded in producing much effect. Augustine laments the frivolous temper of the *emigrés* from Rome, who, though on disembarking they were in a most wretched condition, found no more urgent occupation than flocking to the theatres. A poet of Southern Gaul[3] who was writing at the time of the invasion of the Alani and the Vandals has drawn for us a curious picture of these early days following disaster: "We are always the same, always in the power of the same vices. Here is one who used to remain at table till nightfall: he finds a means of banqueting by the light of lamps just as well as by that of the sun. Pedius was an adulterer; an adulterer he remains: his Furies have not deserted him. Podion was of an envious mood: jealousy still holds him fast. Albus dreamed only of honours and dignities: ambition still gnaws him on the ruins of his city."

The case of the Empire was the same as that of individuals. Once the moments of alarm had passed, the Court, the official classes, the whole worn-out machinery was set in motion again, without even a thought on the part of any one of its reformation.

[1] Pope Innocent was absent at the time of the last siege. He happened to be at Ravenna with other prominent men of Rome for the purpose of negotiating an arrangement between the Emperor, Alaric, and the Senate.

[2] On the invasion in Gaul see Paulinus of Pella, *Eucharisticon*, vv. 226 ff.

[3] *S. Paulini Epigramma* in *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*, vol. xvi., p. 504.

However, the Barbarians who had entered into the Empire formed a class within it, increasingly numerous and increasingly influential. When they had ceased to ravage and had settled down to some extent, with or without the assent of the imperial authorities, it was imperative to come to terms with them and to become accustomed to their presence. This was achieved: gradually people schooled themselves to regarding them as possible heirs of the dying Empire.

Religiously-minded persons, who, even before the final disasters, had acquired a distaste for the world, found themselves less disposed than the rest to demonstrations of sorrow for its downfall. But what they viewed without regret was the disappearance of the futility of the age in general rather than the loss of the prestige of Old Rome. The *Res Romana* was ever dear to the heart of people like Jerome, Augustine, and Paulinus. They would have loved it better when illustrated by the severity of ancient virtues and ruled by men of the type of Fabricius and Cincinnatus. But even in the state in which they saw it, with its impoverished senate, its pinchbeck court, and its decayed hierarchy, they loved it still. They belonged to it too closely, both by education and in every fibre of their being, to dream for a moment of separating themselves from it. Besides, the men I have just named had had little or no contact with the barbarians. It was in Gaul and in Spain that the latter, when viewed at close quarters and at a more auspicious time, began to be regarded with a favourable judgement. Salvian was soon to contrast them with the Romans, and to do so to their advantage. But even at this moment, on the morrow of the invasion, the literary works of the invaded countries show some marks of goodwill. Orosius already sees the good side of the barbarians.

CHAPTER VI

PELAGIUS

THE dread inspired by Alaric had begun to denude Rome of inhabitants well before the catastrophe of 410. Many patrician families were possessed of estates of considerable value in Africa; all hoped to find there a secure retreat, the sea being the best of all barriers to the progress of the barbarians. Africa had the character of an asylum towards which people betook themselves in haste, despite the discomforts of the passage. It was in these circumstances that there landed at the port of Carthage the illustrious family of the Anicii Probi, conducted by Anicia Faltonia Proba, the widow of the great Probus. Of her three sons of consular rank, the two younger seem to have remained in Italy: the eldest, Olybrius, had died at the time of their departure,[1] but his widow, Juliana, and his daughter, Demetrias, had accompanied Proba. Heraclian, the Count of Africa, gave the fugitives from Rome a very unfavourable reception. He imposed a tax on them upon their arrival, and if they did not pay they were exposed, especially the women, to the worst hardships.[2] Proba paid, and extricated from their difficulty a number of her companions in misfortune.

Demetrias was still very young, but she was approaching a marriageable age. It was soon made known that she would not marry and would dedicate her virginity to God. This was a source of great joy to religiously-minded persons. The Probi were renowned throughout the whole world: it was the

[1] Proba, it seems most probable, had left Rome before the month of August 410. Olybrius, indeed, *non vidit patriam corruentem* (Jerome, *Ep.* cxxx. 3), that is he died before the taking of the city, and on the other hand Proba had already sought refuge from the barbarians when she received the news of her son's unexpected death (*Ibid.* 7).

[2] Jerome, *Ep.* cxxx. 7, with allowance for his exaggerations. *Cf.* Pallu de Lessert, *Fastes des provinces africaines*, vol. ii., p. 270.

great Christian family of Rome. All the distinguished men of the age, Augustine, Jerome, Chrysostom, Pope Innocent, had long been singing the praises of the illustrious widow of Probus and of her daughter-in-law Juliana. To the merits acquired by her inexhaustible charity was now to be added the supreme act of dedication. In the noble house where Christianity had so long reigned was now to be seen the unfolding of the virgin flower of asceticism. Claudian had hymned the princely marriages of Ravenna; Proba desired that the mystic nuptials of her granddaughter should also have their epithalamium. At her instigation practised pens set themselves to work: this taking of the veil was the occasion of quite a large literary output, of which we still possess two specimens, both sent from Palestine—by the solitary of Bethlehem and by the monk Pelagius,[1] a new celebrity, some of whose ideas were beginning to be discussed, especially in Africa. The Bishop of Carthage, Aurelius, presided at the ceremony and conferred on Demetrias the veil of the consecrated virgins (414).

Pinianus and Melania had also crossed the sea but, having little relish for the society of large towns, had not made a stay at Carthage. Hippo itself seemed to them too noisy, and in spite of the attraction of Augustine, who had long been the friend and correspondent of their family, they preferred to settle themselves at Thagaste, where the good bishop Alypius with whom they were also acquainted, gave them the kindliest of welcomes. Aurelius, Alypius, and Augustine gave them guidance in the disposal of the fortune of which they were stripping themselves. Their presence in Africa was a blessing for the monks, the monasteries, and charitable enterprises The people of Thagaste rated very high the privilege which they enjoyed in possessing them, and this privilege excited the envy of other towns. One day[2] they adventured themselves at Hippo. The members of St Augustine's flock seized the opportunity and demanded, with tumultuous violence, that Pinianus should be ordained priest. A promotion thus imposed by the multitude was not an unheard-of thing: it was in such circumstances that Paulinus had been ordained at Barcelona, and that Augustine himself had become a priest of Hippo.

[1] Jerome, *Ep.* cxxx.; Pelagius in Migne *Patrologia Latina*, tom. xxx., p. 15, or tom. xxxiii., p. 1099.

[2] On this matter see Augustine, *Epp.* 125, 126.

Hence Pinianus had taken precautions: he had secured a promise from Augustine that he would not ordain him nor allow him to be ordained. But the mob would listen to nothing: it gave vent to scandalous outcries against the Bishop of Thagaste, who had accompanied the young couple to Hippo and was in the church in company with Augustine. Threats were uttered of doing him injury. Pinianus was obliged to swear to take up his abode at Hippo, and that, if ever he allowed himself to be ordained, it should be for this Church. On these terms the ceremony was allowed to be brought to an end. Alypius and his two friends returned for the time to Thagaste. Albina for her part greatly resented this adventure, and Alypius also was highly incensed against the people of Hippo. They both of them wrote to the bishop, inveighing against the greed of his flock and disputing the validity of promises extorted by tumult. Augustine did not share their view: according to him, if the populace of Hippo was so greatly attached to Pinianus, it was because of his virtues and not for his money; besides, oaths were made to be kept.

The matter settled itself on its own account. Pinianus and Melania at last saw the bottom of their purse: the spectacle of their life of austerity seemed less indispensable to the people of Hippo, who were able to contemplate at close quarters the virtues of St Augustine. They restored no doubt to Pinianus the pledge that he had given them, for after a stay of seven years in Africa the Roman noble, who had become in the fullest sense the poor man of Jesus Christ, set out for the East in company with his wife and his mother-in-law. When they arrived at Jerusalem the state of their finances was such that they were obliged to inscribe their names on the register of the Relief Committee of the Church among the number of the needy.

Some time before their departure, the Probi had taken up their abode again in Rome: Demetrias with her veil as a virgin had returned to the *Domus Pinciana.*

But it was not merely the representatives of the great families of Rome who had temporarily made at once a sojourn and a sensation in Africa. Among the number of refugees who had arrived from Rome had been seen also the monk Pelagius and his disciple Celestius, two persons who were about to give rise to much talk and to be the cause of great storms.

Serious Christians in the West, those at any rate who devoted themselves to thinking and writing, had for some time been divided by a grave conflict of opinions. While all were agreed as to the necessity of the practice of virtue and even of advancing oneself as far as possible along the paths to perfection, they were not at one as to what might be called the theory of sanctity. Here Augustine and Pelagius represent two opposed systems. Augustine who had arrived at virtue by passing through vice and who had only come forth from his evil courses as the result of feeling himself seized very firmly by the hand of God—Augustine owed to his own experience a profound sense of human weakness and of divine succour. According to him, a man is virtuous, he does that which is good, because God gives us the will and the power thereto, in other words succours us by His grace; from ourselves we can extract only sin. And why are we so made? By the fault of Adam, from which proceed all our frailties, all our weaknesses physical and moral, sicknesses, death, and that interior dislocation which sets at perpetual strife within us the consciousness of the Law and the promptings of concupiscence. Adam sinned: his whole posterity sinned in him, for what is here involved is not merely some sort of falling away, but a falling away which is culpable,[1] which entitles God to avenge on each of us the fault committed by our first father. In the sight of God, the human race is a sinful mass, *massa peccati*, *massa perditionis*, from which the Author of all Justice could not extract any other good save what He puts into it Himself.

For Pelagius, and in this respect he represents to us a considerable body of his contemporaries, things present themselves under quite a different aspect. A man is virtuous because he wills it strongly and because he gives himself the trouble to be so. God helps him in this, no doubt, but as it were from without, by means of the free will with which He has provided us, by means of His Law which enlightens and commands us, by means of the example and the exhortations of the saints, and especially of Christ, and by means of the

[1] St Augustine is here emphasizing the famous passage of St Paul (Romans v. 12 ff.): it is right to note that the words ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον on which he lays great stress are badly rendered in the Latin Vulgate by *in quo omnes peccaverunt*, and mean not "*in whom* all have sinned" but "*because* all have sinned."

purifying grace of Baptism. In other respects, the good that we do is attributable to us. This good we are under obligation to do, for it would not be commanded us if it were not in our power to attain it. God enjoins the avoidance of all sin: a man can, then, be without sin; and in Pelagius' thought, sin means not only grave and external faults but interior defects which occur in the secret recesses of the soul. This austere and heroic morality fitted in well enough with the conception of virtue held in the ancient schools, with the sort of popular Stoicism on which the life of good people was ordinarily based. Pelagius admitted neither Original Sin nor Original Fall. What talk is this of sin transmitted by heredity? was a question in Pelagian circles. A sin is an act of will; he only who has committed it is responsible for it. It has no consequence which affects his descendants. If we feel within us the assaults of concupiscence, if our body is frail and subject to the law of death, that means that such is the nature of man. Thus, Adam was created by God in the state in which we ourselves come to the world; what we derive from our first father are the original conditions of human nature, not the consequences of an initial fault.

Between these two conceptions of virtue the difference or, as it may better be called, the opposition is manifest. Augustine's is the expression of a profound religion, that of Pelagius is but conventional popular morality—adapted, however, to the general outlines of Christian tradition.

I say to the general outlines. On the other hand, two points must at once be noted on which the teaching of Pelagius was in conflict with ordinary Christian modes of thought. His conception of grace to a large extent excluded prayer. What is the good of asking God to defend us against temptation, to help us to be virtuous, when once it is a concern of our own.

The baptism of small children was, as will soon be made clear, a second stone of stumbling.

As for the testimony to the tradition of the Church which might be derived on this point from authors earlier than the 5th century, it was undoubtedly more weighty than Pelagius seems to have thought; but it would not admit of being uniformly invoked for all the details of the Augustinian teaching. The idea of the Original Fall, flatly rejected by Pelagius, had been often and clearly expressed before his

time; but that this fall must be conceived of as an hereditary sin and that this hereditary sin must be identified[1] with concupiscence are theories to which little reflexion had as yet been given.

St Augustine is the first who studied the question deeply. Among the views which he expressed on the subject, a certain selection must be made and it must be recognized that for some of them the responsibility of the great Doctor is more closely involved than that of the Church. In following him in his struggle against Pelagius, the Church has followed the defender of the common Faith as to the necessity of grace and the original *lapse*. She has even retained his idea of hereditary *sin*, but with reserves and explanations which to some small extent have modified it. In the further stages of theological reflexion, St Augustine has remained always and with just title the Doctor of Grace; but it has been necessary to abandon more than one detail of his line of argument and even of his teaching.[2]

Pelagius was a native of the Island of Britain.[3] He was a man of considerable stature and of robust appearance. By profession a monk, he seems to have travelled in the East. In any case he knew Greek and spoke it with ease. He had established himself at Rome since the time[4] of Pope Anastasius (c. 400), perhaps earlier still,[5] and lived there in the society of persons of the deepest piety, among whom he enjoyed great repute.[6] In these circles he made the acquaintance of a priest

[1] On this point, the doctrine actually received in the Catholic Church differs from that of St Augustine, still followed by Bossuet. Original sin is now conceived as the privation of an original righteousness, conferred on the first man over and above the requirements of his nature.

[2] See on the whole subject O. Rottmanner, *Der Augustinismus* (Munich, 1892). The position is a little like that of St Cyril of Alexandria, but with this difference that we have ended by going back to Cyril, while we seem rather to have departed from Augustine.

[3] St Jerome designates him a Scot (Irishman) in order to be able to attach to him the legendary tales then current about the Scots, their barbarism, their cannibalism, etc. (*In Jeremiam*, prefaces to Books I. and III.).

[4] Marius Mercator, *Liber Subnotationum*, 2.

[5] "In urbe Roma, ubi diutissime vitam duxerat" (Aug. *De gratia Christi*, ii. 24.)

[6] Aug. *De peccatorum meritis*, iii.: "Pelagii scripta, viri, ut audio, sancti et non parvo provectu christiani"; *ibid.* 5, "bonum ac praedicandum virum"; cf. *Retractationes*, ii. 33, "Vita ejus a multis praedicabatur." It

of Syrian origin who was called Rufinus like Jerome's famous adversary, but must not be confused with him, for he was the companion of Pammachius.[1] It was held in later times that, whether through this Rufinus of Syria or through travels in the East, Pelagius became acquainted with the ideas of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who on the subject of the original Fall professed opinions akin to his own. It may be so, but it would be extending simplification beyond due limits to consider Pelagius a disciple of Theodore[2] and even to attach to Pelagius' own teaching all the Pelagians soon to be numbered in the West. Not only in Britain and in Gaul, but in Northern and Southern Italy, in Africa, in Rome itself, a large number of persons and those not merely nominal Christians but people of piety and strict in their observance, took exactly the same view as Pelagius of the relationship of morality and religion. Pelagius must be regarded as the representative of a tendency rather than as an originator.

At Rome he discoursed freely on the most serious subjects, laying special stress on austerity and preaching by example as much as by what he said. He published a treatise on the Trinity and a *Liber Capitulorum*, a collection of texts similar to those of Cyprian and of Priscillian. The first of these works is lost; the second is extant only in fragments; and in them were found later various subjects for censure. We still possess,

should be noted that Augustine is here addressing himself to Marcellinus, who, being a Roman and in touch with pious circles, would know Pelagius personally. Paulinus regarded him with affection and counted him among his correspondents (Aug. *Ep.* 186, 1; *De gratia Christi*, i. 38).

[1] Aug. *De gratia Christi*, ii. 3. It is impossible to suppose that Rufinus of Aquileia lived with Pammachius, the intimate friend of Jerome and his own opponent. Besides, Rufinus had friends at Rome and on the Caelian Hill who would not have allowed him to stay anywhere but with them. It is perhaps to this Rufinus of Syria or to his circle that we ought to refer the Confession of Faith, at once Pelagianizing and Nestorianizing, which was published by Sirmond in 1650 (Migne, *P. L.* xlviii., p. 451, *Haec nostra fides est*; cf. tom. xxi., p. 273) under the name of a Rufinus "of Palestine."

[2] Theodore teaches that God wills that His creatures should pass from the state of imperfection, of mutability and of mortality, to the state of perfection, of immutability and of immortality. These are the two states or "catastases." But God wills also that His creatures should merit the change; and, since they are incapable of this of themselves, Jesus Christ performs the meritorious work and applies its effect to men. It is in this sense that He is the second Adam.

complete, a commentary of his on the Epistles of St Paul, a work in which his doctrines are even less concealed than in the former but which does not seem to have given greater offence.[1] Conflict only arose when the thought of the British monk clashed with that of Augustine. The latter in his *Confessions* addresses himself to God in these terms: "O Lord, give what thou commandest and command what thou wilt. *Da quod iubes et iube quod vis!*" Pelagius, it was said later, showed himself much disturbed by this language. However, no written controversy resulted.[2] An oral discussion might have taken place when Pelagius landed at Hippo, after his escape from Rome in 410. But Augustine was away. Pelagius scarcely saw him at Carthage, whither he immediately betook himself. The Bishop of Hippo was absorbed at this moment in the conference with the Donatists. The monk departed for Palestine without any incident having occurred.

Among the people who shared Pelagius' opinions was speedily distinguished a former advocate named Celestius, a celibate by necessity[3] and perhaps by conviction, a man of

[1] Marius Mercator (*Comm.* 2) indeed tells us that Pelagius had put it out for his friends *his . . . de quorum amicitia confidebat.* It would be rash to infer from this statement of an opponent that Pelagius' commentary was an esoteric work. St Augustine, who often quotes it, never represents it as such, and in any case the circle of "friends" of Pelagius was too wide for a book intended for them not to be a book for the public—of course a special public—interested in these matters. By a singular chance Pelagius' commentary came to us first under the name of St Jerome: we find it printed at the end of his works (*P. L.* tom. xxx., p. 645); but it also circulated, especially in Ireland, under the name of the real author, as is shown by the texts collected by H. Zimmer in his book *Pelagius in Irland* (1901). In particular there will be found there the variants of a St Gall MS. (No. 73, saec. ix.) which formerly bore, without any disguise, the name of Pelagius, and which presents a text void of certain corrections introduced by the pseudo-Jerome. Since Zimmer's publication Mr A. Souter has made a notable addition to the documentary authority for the Commentary of Pelagius. (*The Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of Paul* in vol. ii. of the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1907.)

[2] In the *Revue Bénédictine*, vol. xxvi. (1909), p. 163, Dom. G. Morin gives a detailed account of a Pelagian treatise, *De induratione cordis Pharaonis*, recovered by himself from the MSS. and intended to be published in the *Anecdota Maredsolana.* It is possible, as Dom. Morin seems to think, that this writing is attributable to Pelagius himself and to the time with which we are dealing. Like the Commentary on St Paul, this treatise has been preserved to us under the name of St Jerome.

[3] "Eunuchus matris utero editus" (Marius Mercator, *Comm.* 1).

ardent and adventurous spirit, very ready to put himself forward and exceedingly talkative. He lived for some time in Rome, in the circle of Pelagius. In the system of Pelagian doctrine the part to which he paid more particular attention was the question of the original downfall: he expounded it in various writings, one of which bearing the name "Against the transmission of sin, *Contra traducem peccati*," or some very similar title, is already mentioned by Pelagius in his commentary on St Paul. Pelagius, on his own part, insisted less readily on this point in the common doctrine. Like his master, Celestius crossed to Africa about the year 411; but, instead of following Pelagius to the East, he settled at Carthage and even took some steps to secure his own admission among the priests of that Church. Then was the time that he found his progress checked. There was living at Carthage, as administrator of the African property of the Church of Milan,[1] a former deacon of St Ambrose, named Paulinus. He had little taste for Celestius' views, formulated a charge of heresy against him, and gained the support of Bishop Aurelius. The matter was tried at a local Council in which Augustine was not present.[2] Several propositions,[3] drawn more or less verbatim from the books of the accused and in any case reproducing the genuine basis of his teaching, were decided to be inadmissible and heretical, and Celestius was requested to retract them. This might have been expected; for anyone who admitted the incriminated propositions directly denied

[1] *Praedestinatus*, i. 88 (*P. L.* liii., p. 617).

[2] Of the official record of this Council a fragment only remains to us, in St Augustine's *De gratia Christi*, ii. 3.

[3] Aug. *De Gestis Pelagii*, c. 21; Marius Mercator, *Comm.* 1. I quote the latter, as its order is more natural:—

1. Adam mortalem factum, qui sive peccaret, sive non peccaret, moriturus fuisset.
2. Quoniam peccatum Adae ipsum solum laesit et non genus humanum.
3. Quoniam parvuli qui nascuntur in eo statu sunt in quo fuit Adam ante praevaricationem.
4. Quoniam neque per mortem vel praevaricationem Adae omne genus hominum moritur neque per resurrectionem Christi omne hominum genus resurgit.
5. Quoniam lex sic mittit ad regnum caelorum quomodo et Evangelium.
6. Quoniam et ante adventum Domini fuerunt homines impeccabiles, id est sine peccato.

the reality of the original Fall and indirectly the necessity of Redemption. The special question of sin transmitted by heredity was not raised in these propositions, but it formed none the less part of the discussion; for the first time,[1] as it would seem, the innovators found themselves confronted with an ecclesiastical argument which they had not thought of at first and which was to give check to their whole teaching—the Baptism of Infants. Against this practice, immemorial and traditional as it was, there was nothing to urge. But the baptism of infants, like that of adults, was considered as involving remission of sin, *in remissionem peccatorum*. The sin of the new-born not being capable of being a sin of will, must necessarily be a sin of nature. This very simple reasoning, based on the Symbolum Fidei and on the institutions of the Church, established, as against Celestius and his party, not only the original downfall, but original sin. Here we can eliminate Augustine and his exegesis: had Augustine never existed, Pelagianism, once drawn into the light, would have been stopped short.[2]

Celestius, without disputing the necessity of Baptism for little children,[3] nevertheless refused the retraction which was demanded of him. The question of Original Sin was, according to him, a question open to controversy and one on which people might differ in opinion. The Council excommunicated him. He protested and appealed to the Holy See; and then, without following up the appeal, set sail for Ephesus, where he succeeded in securing a place for himself in the body of priests.[4]

[1] Dr Loofs in his learned article "Pelagius und der pelagianisches Streit" in Hauck's *Encyclopädie*, xv., p. 754, remarks that in his Commentary on St Paul where all his errors have found expression Pelagius says not a word about the Baptism of Infants.

[2] This does not mean that obscure points were wanting. What is clear is that the institutions of the Church presuppose Original *Sin*: what is not clear is wherein exactly Original Sin consists and what body of evidence can be furnished for it by Scripture and the reasoning of theologians. On these points the Council of Carthage left a place for a great task which St Augustine did but begin and which pursued its course for long centuries.

[3] According to him, without Baptism children could not attain to "the Kingdom of Heaven"; but Baptism did not remit them any sin, nor did the omission of it deprive them of "eternal life."

[4] This seems fairly to imply that, like Pelagius, he was well acquainted with the Greek language.

The leaders of the movement had been transplanted to the East; but in the West their ideas had supporters enough to make it impossible to consider the matter done with. Even at Carthage the Pelagians, to give them at once a name which did not become customary till a little later, were a fairly large body and exceedingly active. Augustine when apprised of the position, entered into the controversy by discussions, by sermons, and by writings.[1] Replies were made to him; the authority of the Church of the East was set against that of the Council of Carthage; he was even treated as himself a heretic. From Sicily he received grave reports. Doctrines were being taught at Syracuse of a similar kind to those which had caused disturbance at Carthage.[2] These doctrines presented themselves in the guise of edifying discourses, some specimens of which have been recovered in recent times.[3] The adversaries of Grace and of Original Sin were recruited, as I have already said, from the most distinguished ranks of Christian asceticism; hence Augustine omits no formality in refuting them. He scarcely mentions Celestius by name; Pelagius and he were still in correspondence.[4] It was at this time (c. 414) that Pelagius addressed his famous letter to Demetrias.

Though opposed in Africa, Celestius and Pelagius made progress in the East. The one was a member of the clergy of Ephesus; the other, while still remaining a monk, occupied at Jerusalem a considerable position. Bishop John, the former protector of Rufinus, was still there; he showed much favour to the new-comer, around whom there gathered no doubt some who were faithful to the memory of Melania. All this was little calculated to give pleasure at Bethlehem. From Jerome's point of view it was Rufinus come to life again: a Latin confrère established at Jerusalem, powerful through his good relations with the Bishop, influential in the Latin society of the Holy Places and even in that of Rome, as was shown by

[1] *Serm.* 170, 174, 176, 290, 294; *De Peccatorum Meritis* and the *De Spiritu et Littera*, addressed to Marcellinus, the mediator in the conference with the Donatists.

[2] Aug. *Ep.* 156, a letter of Hilary, with Augustine's reply, *Ep.* 157.

[3] The six letters edited by Caspari, *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten aus den zwei letzten Jahrhunderten der kirchlichen Alterthums* (Christiania, 1890). Cf. *supra*, p. 147, note 2.

[4] *Ep.* 146.

his correspondence with Demetrias.[1] Rumblings soon began to make themselves heard. Pelagius troubled himself little about them, and devoted himself to turning with zest the pages of the books that Jerome had written in bygone days, before his breach with Origen. Jerome now spoke of the Scoti and their heavy-lying porridge, of Grunnius and his clumsy pupils.[2] Then came his letter to Ctesiphon[3] in which he takes Pelagius to task not exactly on the fundamental basis of his teaching, but on the assertion that a man can be without sin—an assertion to which Augustine did not attach any very great importance. But it was important in Jerome's eyes, for in his view it was allied to the pretension of certain monks like the "Origenist" Evagrius who believed that they could arrive through asceticism at a state superior to the passions (ἀπάθεια). Ctesiphon seems to have been the medium of communication with a devout and illustrious family (the Probi?) into which Jerome did not wish to see heresy find its way.

We have now reached the year 415. Jerome was determined not to confine himself to his letter to Ctesiphon: he was working at a second polemical treatise couched in the form of a dialogue, though he refrained from mentioning his adversaries by name. The position of Pelagius was still strong enough to make anyone hesitate to make him personally the object of attack.

In the course of these proceedings there arrived from Africa a young Spanish priest, named Orosius,[4] who had come to Hippo to consult Augustine about the heresies of his own country and had been sent by him to Palestine. The ostensible reason was that Orosius might obtain fuller information from the learned monk of Bethlehem, and take the opportunity at the same time of propounding to him problems of theology[5]; at bottom, as I suspect, it was an effort to dislodge Pelagius from a position which made him a source of considerable annoyance.

Augustine at this time was on good terms with Jerome.

[1] See also his letter to Livania (Juliana?), if it is really his—which one may doubt (Jerome, *Dial. adv. Pelag.* iii. 14 f.; Marius Mercator, *Commem.* iv. 3; Aug. *De Gestis Pelagii*, 14, 19).

[2] *In Jeremiam*, prefaces. [3] *Ep.* 133. [4] *Supra*, p. 137.

[5] On the subject of the origin of the soul and on the inequality of sins (Jerome, *Epp.* 131, 132; Aug. *Epp.* 166, 167).

He had not always been so. The African Master had early felt a desire to enter into communication with the learned monk of Palestine. Mishaps to correspondence, letters which went astray and then were opened and cast before the eyes of the public, at first put Jerome on the defensive. It was in the thick of the Origenist quarrel. Augustine, without suspecting it, had hit sensitive spots and raised inopportune questions.[1] He showed too vivid a recollection of the enthusiasm which Jerome had displayed for Origen. He did not see why anyone should be translating the Bible from Hebrew into Latin when the faithful were accustomed to the version of the Seventy —a version invested with such high authority.[2] Such contentions and the round-about ways in which they reached him were calculated to irritate Jerome. He thought that Augustine was trying (by a method which has not been lost) to make a reputation for himself by assailing veteran teachers. Hence he began by answering him with extreme brusqueness. But Augustine exerted so much good grace in soothing him that in the end he succeeded and thenceforward their friendship underwent no further change.[3]

At the time of Orosius' departure Augustine was engaged in the refutation[4] of a new book by the British monk—the *De Natura.* This work had been presented to him by two young men, Timasius and James, at first pupils of Pelagius, to whom they owed their "conversion," and then detached from Pelagianism by the counsels of the Bishop of Hippo. In this treatise Pelagius had thought fit to adduce in support of himself certain ecclesiastical authors: he was to be seen citing Lactantius, Hilary, Ambrose, and—an unexpected touch—Jerome and Augustine himself. It is always tempting to bring

[1] Jerome, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, following Origen and other Greek doctors, had offered a curious explanation of the remonstrances made by St Paul to St Peter. According to him, the two Apostles had made use of dissimulation, played a sort of comedy, when they were both fundamentally in agreement. Augustine, who was extremely scrupulous on the subject of lying, had no kind of taste for this exegesis and made no attempt to conceal the fact from Jerome.

[2] Augustine, of course, believed the legend of the seventy versions made in isolation and identical.

[3] Jerome, *Epp.* 67, 101-105, 110-112, 115, 116.

[4] By his *De Natura et Gratia.* To this same time belongs the *De Perfectione Justitiæ.*

up against one's opponents their own opinions of former days and thus to put them in contradiction with themselves: there is nothing they dislike more. But it is a dangerous game.

Augustine's emissary was more zealous than adroit. Stimulated no doubt by the aged Jerome, he set himself to attack Pelagius with so much vigour and to make such a noise about the African decisions as to secure a summons from the Bishop to a meeting of the clergy.[1] There he repeated his contentions, and invoked the authority of Jerome, Augustine, and the Council of Carthage. Pelagius when invited to defend himself declared—and in this he was upheld by Bishop John—that these African controversies were no concern of his. As he was pressed on the possibility of living without sin, he declared that one could not attain to this "without the aid of God."[2] This discussion led to no practical result—a conclusion rendered the more certain by the fact that Orosius, not understanding Greek, was obliged to avail himself of an interpreter, and an interpreter whom he had ground for regarding with distrust. The Bishop asked him if he offered himself as accuser of Pelagius. He refused to do so: John seemed to him a judge on whom little reliance was to be placed. It was agreed that as the dispute was between Latins the best thing to do was to carry it before Pope Innocent, to abide by his decision, and for both parties meanwhile to abstain from any kind of invective.

This undertaking was not respected. At the Dedication Festival (September 14), Orosius on being admitted to the Bishop's presence to offer congratulations found himself the object of reproaches for making incorrect statements. Unable to restrain himself he drew up, clearly with Jerome's assistance, a long protest addressed to the priests of Jerusalem in which John and Pelagius were taken to task with a good deal

[1] For this assembly, which took place on July 29 or 30, 415, see the *Liber Apologeticus* of Orosius, a much biassed work, naturally; *cf.* Aug. *De Gestis Pelagii*, 37.

[2] In all this Pelagius was much lacking in sincerity. Undoubtedly the sentence of the Council of Carthage referred directly only to Celestius, and he himself had not yet been attacked by name by Augustine. But it is abundantly clear that he had been hit both by the Council and by the arguments of the Bishop of Hippo. As for his recognition of "the aid of God" it was already known that by that he meant something quite different from the meaning of the general body of Christians.

of spirit. In the course of these proceedings two bishops of Southern Gaul, Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, who had been driven from their sees by political revolutions[1] and had sought refuge in the Eastern Empire arrived in Palestine. There they came into contact with Orosius and above all with Jerome, for it is no rash conjecture that this whole campaign against Pelagius was directed from Bethlehem. They were persuaded to lay a formal complaint, not before the Bishop of Jerusalem but before the Metropolitan[2] and his Council, a higher court and one less open to the suspicion of partiality. The complaint was received and the Council met at Diospolis (Lydda) in the month of December 415. But, as one of the two bishops was ill, neither of them appeared. The case was tried without them, the controversy being waged between the accused and the bill of accusation.[3] The course of the proceedings closely resembled those at Jerusalem. There were cited against Pelagius various assertions drawn in some cases from his works, in others from those of Celestius. To the one set he returned explanations of a subtle kind, calculated to impose upon prelates who had little familiarity with this controversy; for the other he declined all responsibility. However an avowal was obtained from him that he anathematized those who should maintain or had maintained the propositions condemned at Carthage.[4] If this did not involve a repudiation of the doctrines of Celestius and of his own, it was an inexcusable prevarication, a lie.[5]

The Council was satisfied with these explanations and declared Pelagius acquitted. It is plain that to the ears of this assembly the questions of Grace and of the original Fall were subjects of some novelty. Besides, the side of the accusers having made default, it was not possible for Pelagius to be closely pressed as he would have been by people versed in the subject. If Jerome, instead of remaining in the back-

[1] *Supra*, pp. 110, 117. [2] Eulogius, Bishop of Cæsarea.

[3] St Augustine, through his *De Gestis Pelagii*, gives us very copious information as to the course of this affair.

[4] "Ad satisfactionem sanctæ synodi anathematizo eos qui sic tenent aut aliquando tenuerunt."

[5] There is no substance in the contention that as the propositions condemned at Carthage did not perhaps reproduce in terms the text of Celestius (Loofs, *op. cit.*, p. 764), Pelagius could repudiate them without disavowing his disciple. This would be altogether too great a refinement.

ground and pushing others to the front, had taken up the accusation abandoned by the two bishops, there is reason to think that the matter would have taken a different turn. From the acquittal of Pelagius one could not, it is true, infer that the episcopate of Palestine accepted his views. But it is not less plain that the decision of Diospolis was of a kind to produce a considerable effect and to give serious cause of annoyance alike to the African bishops and to the other opponents of Pelagius.

Jerome had published, shortly before the Council, his dialogue against the Pelagians, an evidence of his aversion to Pelagius and his doctrine and at the same time of his lack of acquaintance with the theology of Augustine. His commentaries on Ezekiel and on Jeremiah, on which he was at that time engaged and which he was publishing in instalments, are filled with observations disagreeable to his new opponents and to Bishop John. Against the latter he brought up stories half a century old—his compromises (in company with Cyril) with the "Arians": he alleges that if John had abandoned these people it was in opposition to his inclination, in order to be able to become a bishop and to roll in luxury; if from the eminence of his episcopal throne he opens his mouth, it is to give vent to absurd remarks couched in an impossible style.[1]

A method of polemic which had risen to those heights was liable to provoke unpleasant consequences for the author of so many invectives. John was tired of being insulted. After all it was he who was at Jerusalem the lawful authority: no one could call in question his right of repressing the excesses of the monks established in his diocese. The worst of it is that the measures adopted for the purpose were associated with considerable disturbances. It would be impossible to say exactly how far the Bishop's responsibility was concerned in this. But the fact remains that the Latin monasteries of Bethlehem found themselves assailed by a band of disorderly persons; the monks and nuns were violently beaten; the buildings were set on fire; Jerome, Eustochium, and the youthful Paula found refuge only with great difficulty

[1] *In Ezech.* xiv. (xlviii. 10). It was perhaps at this time that the book written against John in 399 (*supra*, p. 34) emerged from Jerome's drawers and was put in circulation.

in a tower: it was a grave blow. I do not know whether in his hour of trouble Jerome called to mind the formal eulogies which he had passed a little while before on the Patriarch Theophilus for having treated the monks of Nitria as he had just been treated himself. This time it was on him that the blows fell; instead of applauding he uttered complaints.

But to whom should he address his complaint? To the Pope—that was the natural course. But Pope Innocent, the unyielding defender of Chrysostom, could not have forgotten with what unbridled vehemence of expression Jerome had espoused against the poor Bishop of Constantinople the campaign of his persecutor Theophilus. The aged recluse made up his mind that the two patrician virgins, Eustochium and Paula, should write at the same time as himself and that the letters should be conveyed through the hands of the Bishop of Carthage. By the same medium Innocent replied that he was quite ready to undertake his defence provided that he laid a formal accusation and named the authors of the outrage. As a further measure of precaution he wrote to John of Jerusalem a letter of considerable severity, reproaching him for a lack, to put it at the lowest, of vigilance.[1] While this exchange of letters was going on, Jerome and Pelagius were compelled to remove to a distance from one another, no doubt by the advice, backed by authority, of persons who were concerned in the restoration of order. Jerome lost no time in comparing the departure of Pelagius to the flight of Catiline: as for his own he explained it by the difficulty of sustaining a controversy with people whose reply to cutting speeches was a cutting blade, and also by the horror with which he regarded Bishop John and communion with him.[2] The separation of the two adversaries did not long continue: we shall soon find them again, the one in his restored monastery, the other in the *entourage* of the Bishop of Jerusalem.

However, Augustine and his friends were in a great state of anxiety. Orosius brought news from Palestine, letters of Heros and Lazarus, and information as to the Council of

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 325-327 (Jerome, *Epp.* 135-137).

[2] *Ep.* 138 *Ad Riparium*, a letter difficult of interpretation; I give here what I take it to mean.

Diospolis. The East, to which such frequent appeal was made at Carthage by Pelagius' supporters, was in fact declaring itself on their side, no longer merely by allowing complete liberty to the leaders of the movement but by a conciliar decision arrived at after an examination of their statements. *There*, whatever one might say at Carthage or at Hippo, Pelagius was not regarded as a heretic. Orosius had no doubt reported the view taken by Jerome, who, in unceremonious language, treated[1] the assembly of the Bishops of Palestine as a "miserable synod." But the great name of Jerusalem was likely to make an impression upon the public. It was important to set another in opposition to it, and thoughts at once turned in the direction of Rome.

Hitherto the idea had not been entertained. It was well known that Pelagius possessed a number of supporters at Rome, and that even among the highest ranks of the clergy. Two dignitaries, Zosimus the future successor of Innocent, and the priest Xystus, who himself also became Pope, were according to report well disposed towards the British monk. People even went so far as to allege that Pope Innocent had allowed himself to be won over.[2] In spite of these reports the Africans were not without hope of getting the Roman Church on their side. Two provincial Councils, one held at Carthage for Proconsular Africa, the other at Milevum for Numidia, wrote to the Pope urging that the new doctrines were in contradiction with the use of prayer and that of the baptism of infants. To the letter of the Council of Carthage was attached the one just received from Heros and Lazarus, and also the official record of the trial of Celestius in 411. A third letter of much greater length, written in the name of Aurelius, Augustine, and three other bishops personally known to the Pope, explained to him the principal heads of the dispute, and showed him the necessity of a condemnation.

Innocent replied to these three letters, congratulating the Africans on having addressed themselves to the Apostolic See and accepting their doctrinal judgement on the necessity of Grace.[3] So far as persons were concerned he held that Pelagius and Celestius were sufficiently compromised by their

[1] *Ep.* 143.

[2] Possidius, *Vita Augustini*, 18 ; *cf.* Aug. *Ep.* 177, 2.

[3] Original Sin is not dealt with in this correspondence.

teaching to deserve exclusion from communion till they came to a better mind.[1]

Innocent's letters are dated January 27, 417. Their arrival caused great joy in Africa. In Augustine's eyes the whole question was already settled. "In regard to this matter," he says in one of his sermons,[2] "two Councils have been referred to the Apostolic See: the replies have arrived. The cause is finished, may the same be equally true of the error." The error was not nearly eradicated, and as for the matter it was to take quite a different turn from that which the Bishop of Hippo had wished.

All these proceedings had taken place without any very clear information in the West as to the Synod of Diospolis. No one had at first troubled himself to procure its Acts. Pelagius, it is true, had addressed a summary of them to Augustine and to the Pope,[3] but without a covering letter. Augustine wrote to the Bishop of Jerusalem, and either through him or in some other way succeeded in procuring the complete text, which enabled him to ascertain that if the Palestinian prelates had acquitted Pelagius, they had in no sense approved of his teaching but rather had condemned it. It was to enforce this view that he wrote his *De Gestis Pelagii*.

[1] All these letters appear in the correspondence of St Augustine, the African letters under the numbers 175, 176, 177; the Roman ones (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 321, 322, 323) under the numbers 181, 182, 183.

[2] *Serm.* 131, 10. Such is the authentic form of the maxim *Roma locuta est, causa finita est.*

[3] This is, I think, the text mentioned by Innocent in his letter to the five bishops, c. 3.

CHAPTER VII

POPE ZOSIMUS

INNOCENT'S replies preceded by only a short interval in Africa the news of his death (March 12, 417) and of his replacement by Zosimus (March 18). This change of persons was big with difficulties.

For a considerable period the Roman Church had been living at peace under the direction of pontiffs of moderate and equable views. The great conflict of the day — the struggle between the religion of the ordinary man and the strict observance—does not seem to have troubled it unduly. Monks were not lacking in Rome nor, as we have already seen, persons of austere life. But the traditional practice was, that while favour was shown to individual efforts after a higher degree of perfection, neither the attainment of this perfection nor the quest of it was regarded as a special title to the government of the Church. Professed monks were even excluded from the clergy: the highest ranks of the army of the Church were recruited from those below, and these in turn from noviciates of a more or less professional type. The result of this was a hierarchy representing a progressive career, a system calculated in a marked degree to maintain uniformity in government. The Pope changed, the guiding power remained the same. Of course some differences were inevitable: Pope Anastasius had exhibited, in regard to Rufinus, less goodwill than his predecessor Siricius and his successor Innocent. But that was a matter of no moment. Zosimus, on his part, represents a real anomaly. The impression derived from his short pontificate is that of a series of undertakings of scanty wisdom and of efforts which failed.

Of the antecedents of this Pope we know absolutely nothing[1];

[1] We do not know whether before his election he was priest or deacon. The *Liber Pontificalis* makes him a Greek, and assigns to him as father a

but it is not without regret that we find him from the outset in intimate relations with a personage who lay open to considerable suspicion, and subject to his influence. This was Patroclus, the new Bishop of Arles. At Arles he occupied the see of a bishop who was still alive, who had not been removed by any ecclesiastical sentence, and could not be so removed because the only reproach that could be brought against him was his endeavours to save the life of the unfortunate Constantine III. But in attempting to snatch this victim from his hands Heros had incurred the enmity of the victorious general, Constantius; and Constantius had got rid of him without the formality of a trial. In accepting a succession of this kind Patroclus gave an indication of his moral worth.[1]

It must be admitted that the position of Bishop of Arles in the circumstances in which it presented itself to him was one of the most attractive kind. Arles had conquered its conqueror: he never ceased to load it with privileges. He had made it the base of the operations of the Empire on the far side of the Alps, the headquarters of a kind of lieutenancy with which he had been invested by the confidence of Honorius. Constantius himself gained in importance every day, and it was no slight advantage to be in his good graces. His successes against the Goths and against the usurpers Constantine, Jovinus, and Attalus gave him the character of Saviour of the Empire. On January 1 of this year 417, at the same time that he inaugurated his second consulate, he celebrated his nuptials with Galla Placidia, who had been at last surrendered by the Goths. He was plainly on the road to the highest rank of all: already with such a sovereign as his brother-in-law he possessed all the reality of power.

certain Abraham, a name that has very little that is Hellenic about it. In spite of the remarks of Harnack (*Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy, 1904, p. 1044) I could not regard as available for use, for the time with which we are dealing, the indications given by the *Liber Pontificalis* as to the family and country of the Popes.

[1] In regard to this and to what follows see my *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, vol. i., pp. 95 ff. It appears that in those times when a bishop was removed from his see by a capital sentence (death, exile, relegation), or by an equivalent measure emanating from the secular authority, the see was considered as vacant. It was in these circumstances that the Roman Church replaced in the 3rd century Pontianus by Anteros, in the 6th century Silverius by Vigilius, in the 7th Martin by Eugenius.

Patroclus, his favourite, was at Rome at the time of the election of Zosimus. Had he some influence in the choice of the new Pope? We do not know. However that may be, Zosimus immediately on his election hastened to heap favours upon him, and to satisfy all his desires. The solemnities of the Easter festival were beginning. Patroclus, one would suppose, might have waited for their close. He did not do so. On Holy Thursday, March 22, there was handed to him a pontifical letter by which the highest privileges were assigned to the Bishop of Arles. In the first place he was provided with a metropolitical jurisdiction which, without regard to established rights, comprised all the provinces of the ancient Narbonensis and the Maritime Alps, from Toulouse to Embrun, from Lake Leman to the Mediterranean. Further he was constituted Vicar of the Pope throughout the whole extent of the Gauls, a position corresponding almost exactly to that occupied by the Bishop of Thessalonica in Illyricum, and was entrusted with the delivery to the bishops of these countries of the letters without which they could not present themselves in Rome.

These innovations, for there is no doubt that they were innovations, were grounded on the merits of Patroclus, on the allegation of an earlier tradition, and on the assumption not less open to dispute that the Church of Arles, founded by Trophimus an emissary of the Holy See, was the Mother-Church from which Christianity had spread throughout the whole of Gaul.

Notified in an imperious tone to the bishops concerned, these decisions of Pope Zosimus did not fail to evoke protests. The system of ecclesiastical metropolises had scarcely introduced itself into Gaul. There were, however, some established positions: the Bishops of Vienne[1] and of Narbonne whose cities were civil metropolises, the Bishop of Marseilles to whom custom assigned a pre-eminence over the Bishops of Narbonensis Secunda, saw themselves disturbed in their possession. Their protests were ill-received: Hilary of Narbonne, who wrote to Rome, was roughly repelled[2]; Proculus of Marseilles, who

[1] Already at the Council of Turin (*c.* 400 A.D.) the Bishops of Vienne and of Arles are in conflict for the metropolitical jurisdiction over the Provincia Viennensis.

[2] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 332.

seems to have troubled himself neither about Patroclus nor his privileges, at length received a sentence of deposition which, however, was not carried into effect.[1] Zosimus saw only with the eyes of the Bishop of Arles; anything which could oppose the schemes of Patroclus was ruled out, and according to him was inspired by the most serious insubordination.

Being thus infatuated with Patroclus, Zosimus could not entertain any very kindly feelings for Heros, his evicted predecessor: he had also been set against Lazarus.[2] In the religious conflicts and in the political vicissitudes of Gaul the two former Bishops of Aix and of Arles had always acted in common. Exile had separated them neither in body nor in spirit. Together they had come to Palestine; together they had taken action against Pelagius. Patroclus alleged that they had voluntarily abandoned their churches, and secured their exclusion from communion with Rome. In such circumstances these personages were scarcely suited to commend to the new Pope the doctrines of St Augustine. It was not long before the fact was perceived.

The condemnations pronounced by Innocent placed Celestius and Pelagius in an awkward position. However they did not regard the situation as desperate. Celestius seems, just recently, to have had difficulties at Ephesus. He betook himself to Constantinople, where Atticus the Bishop[3] did not allow him to remain. Reassured no doubt by the death of Pope Innocent and by the estimate he could form of his successor, he had speedily taken steps to present himself in person and to hand to the new Pope a profession of faith in which he had not failed to declare his complete submission to the judgement of the Holy See. Zosimus interested himself on his behalf. In the course of the summer he held in San Clemente a solemn hearing at which Celestius appeared, and was examined.[4] When asked to condemn the assertions for

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 340, 341.

[2] *Op. cit.* 329, 330, 331.

[3] Marius Mercator, *Comm.* i. 3, adduces on this subject letters sent by Atticus to Asia (Ephesus), to Thessalonica and to Carthage. There was no question of Rome: relations, ruptured on the subject of Chrysostom, had not yet been re-established.

[4] We no longer possess the formal record of this hearing. It is known from what the Pope says of it in the letter which he sent immediately

which Paulinus had accused him at Carthage in 411, he refused. However he accepted the teaching expressed in the letters of Pope Innocent, and nothing but what was worthy of praise was found in his profession of faith as well as in a declaration by which, at Carthage in 411, he had recognized the necessity of baptism for infants.[1] As for the accusations of Heros and Lazarus he declared that those persons had not even known him by sight at the time when they were writing to denounce him; Heros, subsequently, had made him apologies. The impression made by all this upon the Pope and those about him was that the Africans had been precipitate in their action, that the same was true of his predecessor Innocent, and that they had certainly given too much credence to people like Heros and Lazarus. He wrote forthwith to Africa[2] to communicate his impression and to invite those who might have anything to say against Celestius to present themselves two months later.[3]

At Jerusalem Bishop John had died almost at the same time as Pope Innocent. The death of the latter was not yet known in Palestine when the new bishop, Praylius, and Pelagius, both it would seem aware of the condemnation passed upon Pelagius, thought it advisable to write to Rome. Their correspondence, addressed to Innocent, only came into the hands of Zosimus after the meeting in San Clemente. Besides a profession of faith[4] it contained the four books of a treatise on Free Will which had only just been composed by Pelagius.[5] Zosimus called another meeting of the clergy and caused the two letters as well as the other writings to be read. The treatise on Free Will, without disguising the doctrine of Pelagius, at any rate for practised eyes, tempered it by concessions which were only apparently such and

afterwards to Africa (Jaffé, *op. cit.* 329), from the *libellus* of the deacon Paulinus (*P. L.* xlv., p. 1724), and from various writings of St Augustine, especially the *De Peccato Originali*, 5-8; cf. *P. L.* xlviii., p. 498.

[1] Aug. *Ep.* 157, 22.

[2] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 329; *Coll. Avell.* 45.

[3] Towards the end of this letter the Pope censures indiscreet enquiries and discussions, and recalls without mention of name the mishap which had recently befallen Origen and his writings. I am much afraid that here there was an indirect warning addressed to Augustine.

[4] The text is in the Supplement to St Augustine, vol. x. (*P. L.* xlv., p. 1716; *cf.* tom. xlviii., p. 488).

[5] Aug. *De Gratia Christi*, 45; *cf.* 32, 35, 36; *De Peccato Orig.* 19, 24.

purely formal. The author had well calculated his effects: the Roman Synod manifested its joy at hearing statements so orthodox, and almost shed tears at the thought that such people could have been maligned. This, at any rate, is what Zosimus told the Africans in a new letter[1] in which Pelagius is the subject of high encomiums, whilst his opponents, Heros and Lazarus, Timasius and James, meet with very rough treatment.

This sudden change in feelings at Rome seems to have been foreseen by the Africans. Alarming reports had reached them in regard to the new Pope, and this caused them to be anxious. They communicated on the subject with the saint of Nola, a friend of Pelagius, and endeavoured by an urgent appeal to retain him on their side.[2] This move was not ill-timed, for already there was talk of the Pelagians of Nola—Pelagians of so determined a kind that they declared themselves ready to abandon Pelagius, if he should chance to retract his teaching.

At the beginning of November there arrived at Carthage the letter in which Zosimus showed himself inclined to pronounce the innocence of Celestius. By the messenger, a sub-deacon named Basiliscus, the Pope had sent a summons to the deacon Paulinus,[3] Celestius' former accuser, to appear and sustain his accusation before the Roman tribunal. Paulinus declined this invitation, declaring that from the official account of the hearing at San Clemente it seemed to him to follow that the Pope was entirely of the same opinion as himself, and that as Celestius had allowed so much time to elapse since his appeal, the proceedings no longer concerned his opponent of 411. This refusal was more adroit than respectful: Paulinus obviously mistrusted a judge so strongly prejudiced in favour of his adversary.

Archbishop Aurelius, on his side, quickly collected a certain number of bishops to deal with the situation. From this council Zosimus received in the course of the winter a very

[1] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 330, of September 21 (*Coll. Avell.* 46).

[2] *Ep.* 186. The concluding phrase, *Quae autem et de quibus audiverimus*, can scarcely refer to anyone but the Pope and his *entourage*. One could not explain such mysteriousness in reference to Julian of Eclanum or some other person of minor importance.

[3] The notice of summons reached Paulinus on November 2, 417: his reply is dated November 8 (*Coll. Avell.* 47).

long letter[1] in which he was reproached with having allowed himself to be deceived by heretics, with having accepted without qualification the formulary of Celestius, and with having thought that a vague adhesion to the letters of Innocent was sufficient to relieve from proceedings defendants of deeply subtle minds. This document, in combination no doubt with other pieces of information, gave pause to the Pope: in a letter,[2] dated March 21, he replied to the Africans in quite a different tone from that in which he had written to them six months earlier. After a long exordium on the authority of his see, he said that as regarded a final decision he had not desired to do anything without consultation with the bishops of Africa, as was proved by his letter in reference to Celestius; that he could not repel without a hearing a man who was appealing to his justice; and lastly that matters were still in the same position, no sentence having been pronounced.[3]

The Pope's reply arrived at Carthage on April 29, 418, on the eve of a great Council summoned for May 1. Its meeting, which had no doubt been announced to Zosimus, may well have deterred him from taking any precipitate action. All the African provinces and even Spain, by which is meant, I suppose, Mauritania Tingitana, sent representatives. The attendance was more numerous than in ordinary general councils: to those, provinces in which the meeting was not being held sent only two or three delegates; in 418 as many bishops came as could be gathered together; they reached the number of 214. The Council began by formulating in nine canons[4] the Catholic doctrine on Original Sin and

[1] This is lost; but it is described in the Pope's reply, and also in Augustine, *Contra duas Epp. Pelagianorum*, ii. 5.

[2] In this letter, and it would seem in that to which it was a reply, there is no question of any one except Celestius. The matter of Pelagius must have given rise to another correspondence of which we only possess a single item, Zosimus' letter of September 21, 417.

[3] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 342; *Coll. Avell.* 50.

[4] See Quesnel's Collection (ed. Ballerini) in Migne, *P. L.* lvi., p. 486. One of these canons, the third, in which the opinion is censured that infants dying without Baptism occupy in the other world a place intermediate between Heaven and Hell, is wanting in several of the collections of canons in which the text of this Council has come down to us. This suppression is a deliberate one, for the canon is certainly authentic.

the necessity of Grace; these canons were despatched to the Pope with a letter[1] in which the question of persons was set on one side.[2]

After this the Council broke up, not however without establishing a permanent committee, with a view evidently of waiting for the effect of the manifesto and of dealing with difficulties which might arise. In this delegacy Alypius and Augustine represented Numidia: the Bishop of Hippo, it is plain, was the soul of the whole movement.

But it was not only the result of their Council that the Africans were awaiting. The unhappy Zosimus was checked from another quarter. Letters written to Ravenna had secured[3] the intervention of the Government in this theological matter. On April 30, at the moment when the Council was assembling,

[1] Fragments in Prosper, *Contra Collatorem* 5, noting that the two phrases *Erraverunt africana episcoporum concilia* . . . and *Erraverunt ccxiv. sacerdotes* relate to the same Council and that the one in question.

[2] In his Epistle 215 Augustine enumerates the documents thus: "Quod papae Zosimo de Africano concilio scriptum est, eiusque rescriptum ad universos totius orbis episcopos, et quod posteriori concilio plenario totius Africae contra ipsum errorem breviter constituimus." I think that the word "posteriori" refers only to the order of the two councils here mentioned, the first simply African (of Proconsular Africa)—that of the winter 417-418; the other the plenary council of all Africa, that of May 1, 418; and that the *Tractoria* of Zosimus here mentioned between the two is not in its chronological order. Augustine in enumerating the two definitive documents puts first the more authoritative—that of the Pope.

[3] The Pelagians did not lose the opportunity, subsequently, of commenting upon the means employed: *Matronarum oblatis haereditatibus potestates saeculi corrupistis* (Aug. *Opus Imperfectum*, iii. 35). That the rescript had been procured by Aurelius and his party admits of no doubt. Honorius himself recalls the fact to Aurelius in a letter belonging to the following year (*P. L.* lvi., p. 493); *cf.* the title of the rescript of 418 in Quesnel's Collection (*ibid.* p. 490), *Rescriptum acceptis synodi suprascriptae* (*Africanae*) *gestis*. But it is plain that here we must understand a different assembly from that of May 1—no doubt the one referred to above, to which Zosimus replied on March 21. Perhaps what is meant is simply a step taken by Aurelius, apart from any meeting of a council, in the name of the group (*synodus*) of his colleagues.

Some astonishment might be felt that the influence of the Patrician Constantius should not have done more effectual service to Pelagius and Zosimus; but this influence was not the only one which made itself felt on Honorius. His sister, Galla Placidia, counted for something: I should be inclined to think that use was made of her in this business.

there appeared an imperial rescript addressed to the Prætorian Prefects, together with an edict from the latter,[1] setting forth that false doctrines on the origin of man were propagated at Rome and elsewhere by Pelagius[2] and Celestius, that the peace of the Eternal City was disturbed[3] by the disputes which had been caused on this subject, and that it was necessary to deal with the matter. In consequence, Pelagius and Celestius must be expelled from Rome; as for people who should uphold their views any one might accuse them and invoke against them confiscation and exile.

It was too harsh a step. The African Episcopate might well have acted with less precipitation, have permitted religious arguments to act on Pope Zosimus instead of hurling *gendarmerie* across the deliberations of the Roman Church. This brought them unpopularity, and with reason.

For the moment there was nothing to be done but to comply. Zosimus had a long document drawn up and addressed to all the bishops. In it he pronounced the condemnation of Pelagius, of Celestius and of their doctrines.[4] This is what is called his *Tractoria*. It has not been preserved, so that we cannot judge of the touches by which he did not fail to harmonize his two successive attitudes, nor—and this would be more interesting — of the extent to which he adopted the opinions of Augustine. The latter, when once success had been attained and the Pope brought over more or less willingly and more or less completely to his views, devoted himself in his discourses and in his books to toning down any disturbing features that there might have been at certain moments in the attitude of Rome. We find him even pressed into the Pope's service. It was in execution of a commission received from

[1] These two documents are known to us from Quesnel's Collection, c. 14, 15 (*P. L.* lvi., p. 490, 492).

[2] Pelagius was only in Rome from the point of view of the Executive: he had not left the East.

[3] In his *Chronicle* (ad ann. 418) Prosper speaks of a Constantius *Servus Christi*, a former vicarius, who had retired to Rome where he had suffered a good deal from attacks by the Pelagians. Cf. *Prædestinatus*, i. 88 (Migne, *P. L.* liii., p. 618).

[4] The proper order of the official documents, Imperial letters, Pontifical letters, African Councils in this phase of the affair has given rise to much discussion. See especially Quesnel's Thirteenth Dissertation with the Ballerini's apologetic comments (Migne, *P. L.* lvi., p. 959).

Zosimus that he went, in this same year 418, to the Mauritanian Cæsarea, where he had so remarkable a meeting with the Donatist bishop, Emeritus.[1] But the task was not finished when he had set the Pope on his own side and had obtained for orthodoxy thus established the protection of the laws: it was still necessary to convince men's minds. To this Augustine gave himself with zest. His correspondence at this time is packed with explanations on Grace, Free Will, and Original Sin. We have seen what pains he had taken to furnish information to St Paulinus of Nola. He did the same with Dardanus, the Prætorian Prefect of the Gauls, with Optatus, the Bishop of Biskra, with Pelagius' former friends, Anicia Juliana and her daughter Demetrias, and finally with the pious family of the Cælian Hill, who were now transplanted to Palestine — Albina, Pinianus, and the younger Melania. Pelagius had crossed the path of these devout people: they had conversed together: the monk had talked to them in the most edifying way, veiling as was his wont under the ordinary language of the Church anything in his opinions that might have given offence. His friends, in astonishment at the opposition he encountered, had addressed themselves to Augustine who, in order to explain to them the situation, wrote his books on "The Grace of Christ" and on "Original Sin." The letter of Pinianus preceded the catastrophe: the reply only came afterwards. During this time Pelagius, brought before a new Council, on this occasion held under the presidency of Theodotus, the Bishop of Antioch, was definitely excluded from the Holy Places. Theodotus and Praylius, his brother of Jerusalem, communicated the fact to the Pope.[2] This is the last that we hear of the British monk.

Celestius was still at Rome at the moment when the storm burst. When Zosimus, having turned round and made up his mind to condemn him, wished to secure his appearance, Celestius had already vanished. His supporters among the laity offered some resistance; but the clergy followed the Pope in his change of attitude. There had been much talk about the priest Xystus who seems to have occupied a very prominent position in the guidance of the

[1] *Supra*, p. 101. [2] Marius Mercator, *Comm.* iii. 5.

party.[1] He made haste to reassure the Africans, wrote to the Bishops of Carthage and of Hippo, and gave them the most satisfactory assurances.[2]

We can imagine whether such proceedings were pleasant to the dignitaries of Rome and the feelings that they must have entertained towards this African Episcopate from which they received such painful affronts. Besides we are not reduced to conjecture. The ill humour of Zosimus expressed itself in measures of much significance. A Council of Byzacena having to try a bishop in regard to matters in which the public finances were concerned, thought fit to take as assessors, in the capacity of experts, some Receivers of Taxes: the case was tried before them and the bishop was condemned. The latter, instead of appealing from them to the plenary Council of Africa as the legislation of the country required, betook himself to Rome with his complaint and obtained a letter in which the bishops of Byzacena are soundly trounced.[3] We do not know what came of this business. But immediately afterwards another cropped up which was to make a widespread sensation.

There was at Sicca Veneria (El Kef) a priest called Apiarius, a man of very indifferent character, who was a source of much trouble to his bishop. The latter, Urbanus, had been a priest at Hippo: he was one of Augustine's best pupils. It had been necessary to excommunicate Apiarius. He did not accept this sentence; but, like the Byzacene bishop, instead of appealing to the African jurisdictions went straight to Rome to lay a complaint against Bishop Urbanus.

African Canon Law did not allow these references to transmarine jurisdictions.[4] This does not mean that judicial guarantees were lacking in it. For the trial of a grave charge against a bishop it was necessary to collect twelve of his colleagues; six were required if a priest were involved; three in the case of a deacon.[5] From this first tribunal an appeal was allowed to the council of the province presided over by the

[1] "Qui eorumdem inimicorum magni momenti patronus ante iactabatur" (Aug. *Ep.* 91).

[2] Aug. *Epp.* 91, 94.

[3] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 346 (November 16, 418), the only document that we possess in regard to this dispute.

[4] *Cod. Can.* 105, of the Council of 407.

[5] *Cod. Can.* 12.

senior bishop (*doyen*) or primate; from the provincial to the plenary council presided over by the Bishop of Carthage. This was ample enough, except for pleaders in bad causes who, being too well known at home, were certain to deem all the jurisdictions there hostile to them. These preferred to cross the sea and make their way to Rome to give an account of things from their own standpoint, and to solicit acquittals based on imperfect information. Wisdom would have prompted recognition of this state of affairs in Rome, respect for the African organization, and the remission of plaintiffs from over-seas to their home tribunals.

But Zosimus was too highly incensed against the Africans not to seize an opportunity of being disagreeable to them. He admitted the plea of Apiarius and sent him back to Carthage with an extraordinary display of legates—Faustinus, Bishop of Potentia in Picenum, and two Roman priests, Philip and Asellus. If their business had been to preside over an Œcumenical Council[1] there would not have been a greater display of forces. Having small confidence as to the reception that awaited his legates, Zosimus had furnished them with credentials of such a kind that they were authorized to demand the assistance of the civil power. Faustinus, the head of the legation, was a man of domineering and petty disposition, fitted to deal shortly with the Africans; and he did not fail to do so. He had instructions both oral and in writing; the text of the latter has been preserved to us. The legates were to require that bishops should be allowed to appeal to Rome; that they should not go too often to Court[2]; that priests and deacons excommunicated by their bishops should be allowed to appeal to neighbouring bishops; and lastly, that Urbanus of Sicca should be excommunicated or even sent to Rome if he did not correct what was defective in his proceedings against Apiarius. On the two points relating to appeals the Pope invoked certain canons of Nicæa, the text of which was annexed to the instructions of the legates.

The legates from the time of their arrival adopted the most lofty tone in dealing with the Bishop of Carthage and his

[1] The priest Philip was one of the legates of Pope Celestine to the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus (431).

[2] Zosimus seems to have cherished resentment at the steps recently taken at Ravenna for the proscription of the Pelagians.

colleagues, threatening them in case of resistance with an appeal to the civil power. Aurelius felt that they wanted to do him an ill turn and that, if he wished to avoid unpleasant incidents, he must play a cautious game. The African Councils had long ago forbidden bishops to betake themselves unnecessarily to Court. Bishop Urbanus was ready to put right anything that might be open to criticism in his proceedings. There remained the question of the appeals overseas, which was all the more a burning one because in the Council of May 1,[1] the prohibition of them had been defined in the most formal manner. But the Pope had organized his business very badly. In the first place what was demanded for priests and the inferior clergy had long been granted by African usage. And further, the canons of Nicæa which he adduced were not canons of Nicæa but canons of Sardica. In the Roman books they appeared at the end of the true canons of Nicæa, and under the same rubric.[2] This was no doubt the source of the mistake—a mistake which ought not to have been made.

The African bishops had no knowledge of the canons of Sardica. Of this council, which the Donatists sometimes threw at their heads, they were only acquainted with the letter addressed by the dissentient Easterns to Donatus[3]; hence,

[1] *Cod. Can.* 125.

[2] Vol. II., p. 180. The authenticity of the canons of Sardica has been frequently disputed without valid reasons and principally from the desire, more or less avowed, to deprive the Roman Church of the benefit of certain of these decrees—a benefit to which it has, so far as I know, hardly attached any importance. The last attempt of this kind is that of Dr Friedrich in the Proceedings of the Munich Academy, *Die Unächtheit der Kanones von Sardica* (1901-1902) and *Die Sardicensischen Aktenstücke der Sammlung der Theodosius diaconus* (1903); Mr Turner (*Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. iii.) and I (*Bessarione*, vol. iii., p. 129) have given a critical estimate of this work. I had thought at first with Mr Turner (cf. *The Guardian*, Dec. 11, 1895) that the text of the canons of Sardica, which figures in the collection of the Deacon Theodosius, might be derived from a *dossier* sent to Carthage by Cyril of Alexandria with the canons of Nicæa; Dr Friedrich has succeeded, I think, in eliminating this theory. But his own thesis does not gain—far from it. Recent studies on the collection of Theodosius and its Alexandrian sections (see Vol. II., p. 132, note 2, with references to the works of Batiffol and Schwartz) lead to the conclusion that the canons of Sardica already figured in an historico-apologetic *dossier* drawn up at Alexandria in 368, under the eye of St Athanasius.

[3] Vol. II., p. 173.

they were commonly wont to say that the Council of Sardica had been a Council of Arians.[1] But the legates were in no way talking about Sardica: they were alleging certain texts of Nicæa, and those texts were not to be found in the African copies derived from that which Cæcilian of Carthage, who had been present at the famous Council, had brought back from it. From this side the Africans had a hold on Roman diplomacy. They protested their respect for the authority of the Council of Nicæa, but maintained that the canons alleged did not figure in all the copies; that consequently they were doubtful. It was incumbent to establish their authenticity. However, as a testimony of their good intentions they consented to apply them provisionally.[2] They wrote in this sense to Pope Zosimus.

While these events were taking place, news was received at Carthage that Zosimus had just died and that a schism had broken out when his tomb was scarcely closed. There was much evidence that his restless character and his domineering actions had created for him among those immediately about him as many difficulties as in Africa and in Gaul. The Roman clergy was divided; a complaint against the Pope had been carried to the Court of Ravenna; between those who denounced him and himself letters passed of a very acrimonious character. Matters went so far that he sent them a sentence of excommunication, reserving to himself the right to take speedy proceedings against their delegates.[3] He would undoubtedly have done so, had he not fallen seriously ill of an intermittent malady which sometimes put him in agony, sometimes allowed him to recover life.[4] At last he died on December 27 of this year 418 which for him had been so filled with mortifications.

[1] Aug. *Ep.* 44, 6; *Contra Cresconium*, iv. 52. Gratus of Carthage had been present at the orthodox Council, or at any rate had corresponded with it (*Conc. Sard.* c. 8); he speaks of it in one of the canons of the Council of Carthage in 348 (c. 5), but from memory without citing a text.

[2] One cannot see, besides, in what respect the texts alleged could authorize the appeal of Apiarius; he was not a bishop and the first of the two canons did not concern him; as for the other, in order to make it applicable, one would have to consider the diocese of Rome as adjacent in its boundary (*finitimus*) to that of Sicca Veneria—which was not the case.

[3] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 345 (October 3, 418).

[4] *Coll. Avell.* 14.

Whilst he was being buried at San Lorenzo, his archdeacon Eulalius was taking steps to succeed him. Before the funeral ceremony had ended he returned to the Lateran, escorted by his colleagues in the diaconate and by some priests. His supporters were already in possession of the church; they barricaded themselves there and acclaimed the candidate of their choice. The other priests, to the number of about seventy, with the section of the populace which did not desire Eulalius, waited till the next day and assembled in the church of Theodora.[1] Their votes fell on the priest Boniface, a man of learning and wisdom, to whom Pope Innocent had more than once entrusted important missions to Constantinople.[2] He was of advanced age and needed much persuasion to accept. On the following Sunday (December 29) each of the two parties proceeded to the ordination of its candidate: Eulalius was consecrated at the Lateran, Boniface at the Church of Marcellus; Boniface after the ceremony was conducted to St Peter's.

The Prefect of Rome, Symmachus, had just entered on his office. He was the nephew of that Symmachus who, under Theodosius, had been in conflict with St Ambrose; like him he had remained a pagan. He took the side of Eulalius and wrote in this sense to Ravenna, whence he speedily received a reply that he was right and that Boniface must be removed from Rome. The reply arrived on the day of the Epiphany. On this day the Eulalians were assembled at St Peter's, the party of Boniface at St Paul's. Symmachus communicated to them the Emperor's decision and Boniface did not succeed in re-entering the city. The Prefect thought the affair at an end; but the Bonifacians protested to Ravenna where Galla Placidia lent them strong support. On better information the Government admitted that the election was doubtful, summoned the two parties to Ravenna and referred the matter to the examination of a certain number of bishops called together for this purpose. But opinions were divided, and it was impossible to get to the bottom of the matter. The Emperor then determined to convoke a great council to which the bishops

[1] Not to be identified. No doubt one of the basilicas which we are acquainted with, but under a different name.

[2] Palladius, *Dial.* 4; Jaffé, *Regesta*, 309.

of Gaul and Africa were to be invited. This assembly was appointed for June 13; and was to take place at Spoleto. Meanwhile, Eulalius and Boniface were to be excluded from Rome; if they attempted to re-enter it, their election would be considered as not having taken place.

The Easter festival was approaching[1]: it was regarded as important that at Rome the ceremonies should be presided over by a bishop; the Court made choice of the Bishop of Spoleto, Achilleus. At this news Eulalius broke his ban and entered the city (March 18); Achilleus, after having sent to the Prefect his letters of commission, presented himself two days later (March 20). Then arose disputes without end and commotions which disturbed the populace during the last days of Lent. The Prefect veered round and demanded instructions. He received them and in a very precise form; Eulalius was to be removed from Rome. Symmachus signified this order to him on the evening of Good Friday (March 28). As his sole reply Eulalius made himself master on the following night of the Lateran basilica and prepared to celebrate in it the ceremonies of the Easter baptism. This was too much: the Prefect set his people in motion, recovered the church and handed it over to the Bishop of Spoleto, who officiated on the following days under the protection of the authorities. Eulalius had been escorted out of Rome and placed under a strong guard.

His rash adventure greatly simplified the matter. The conditions had been violated by him: his candidature was thenceforth ruled out, without the need of holding a council. The Court informed the bishops that there was no need for them to put themselves to the trouble, recognized Boniface, and gave the Prefect orders accordingly. A few days later Symmachus despatched to Ravenna a report in which he stated with what unanimous joy the Romans had received their new Pope.

The official documents[2] from which our information on this affair is derived do not indicate clearly the origin and the precise meaning of this division of parties. In particular, we do not see to what extent it was connected with the recent controversies on Pelagius and Celestius. It cannot be without relation to the conflicts with which in the last months of

[1] Easter Sunday fell in 419 on March 30. [2] *Coll. Avell.* 14-36.

Zosimus the Roman clergy was torn. Boniface, it is quite certain, was not a friend of Patroclus: he did not continue towards him the favour passing all belief which Patroclus had enjoyed under his predecessor. On the other hand, it is plain that Placidia supported Boniface and did so with much energy. In her eyes Eulalius represented vice and Boniface virtue. She expressed her view very directly in three letters[1] addressed on the subject of the council to the Bishops Paulinus, Aurelius, Augustine, and others on whose presence she laid much stress. Paulinus especially, whom she regarded as the president of the future assembly, seemed to her qualified to lead the triumph of holiness over ambition and immorality. It is possible that the feelings of the pious princess were not, on this point, in accord with those of her husband. The *ménage* was not an altogether united one; it was not without reluctance that the daughter of Theodosius had made up her mind to espouse the conqueror of Arles. He had been proclaimed Augustus on February 8, 421, by his brother-in-law Honorius: this promotion, which was regarded with disfavour in the East, would have embroiled the two Empires had not the new Emperor died (September 2) a few months after his elevation.

During the conflict between Eulalius and Boniface the legates of Zosimus had remained at Carthage. The affair of Apiarius was not entirely settled; at any rate it had not been examined in a plenary Council, with the result that the reply sent to Zosimus was neither complete nor invested with adequate authority. The plenary Council met in May, 419. At the session on the 25th, Faustinus, Philip, and Asellus presented once more the text of their instructions. The Africans demanded that the canons alleged should be collated with the copies of the Council of Nicæa which must be preserved at Constantinople, at Antioch, and at Alexandria; the legates would have wished that the enquiry should be made at Rome itself with the means at disposal there. But the Africans held firm.[2] They secured the presence of the legates at the reading

[1] These letters appear in the *dossier* (*Coll. Avell.* 25, 27, 28) under the name of the Emperor Honorius. Dr W. Meyer (*Index Scholarum*, Göttingen 1888-89, p. 10) had already recognized that Letters 27 and 28 are those of Placidia and not of Honorius: this is no less clear as to Letter 25.

[2] As a matter of fact they confined themselves to questioning the Bishops

of their former councils—a reading which was customary: the Roman envoys could gather that the Church of Africa possessed a code of considerable completeness, such as was unknown in Italy. Then they were sent away with the formal records of the assemblies in which their business had been dealt with and a letter for Pope Boniface. Bishop Urbanus made amends for the errors of form which had been charged against him; Apiarius, after having asked pardon for his fault, was relieved of his excommunication; but as it was impossible to retain him at Sicca he was given letters which would secure his reception elsewhere. It was announced that the alleged canons would be verified in the East, and the Pope was desired to verify them on his side at the same sources. In the meantime they agreed to observe them. But even if they should chance to be recognized as authentic, and if it should be settled that the Pope, not content with demanding their observance in Africa, should cause them to be applied in his own neighbourhood, a strong hope was expressed that they would not again be compelled to submit to treatment such as that which they had experienced and which they would rather not recall. "We believe," the bishops add, "that by the mercy of God with your Holiness presiding over the Roman Church we shall not have to suffer any more from arrogance of this kind, and that methods of procedure will henceforward be observed in dealing with us of which we shall not feel under obligation to complain." It is clear that bishops like Aurelius, Augustine, Alypius, and others did not use language of this kind without grounds, and that all the statements and proceedings of the legates of Zosimus do not appear in the official records of the Council. Little gratification must have been felt in Rome at the result of their mission.

This did not prevent a new beginning on the first opportunity, and this time it caused St Augustine himself the most serious annoyance. There was in his diocese a town, at a considerable distance from Hippo, called Fussala. Its inhabitants were all Donatists: Augustine was obliged to give himself a great deal of trouble in order to bring them into union. The priests whom he sent to them at first were stripped,

of Alexandria and of Constantinople: their replies have been preserved (*Cod. Can.* 135, 136). These were transmitted from Carthage to Pope Boniface (*Ibid.* 138).

beaten, to the loss of limbs and even of life. However the resistance was at last overcome; and Augustine then judged that a bishop living on the spot was indispensable for the maintenance of peace. To this end he invoked the co-operation of the presiding bishop (*doyen*) of Numidia who transported himself from a great distance to Fussala. Augustine presented to him one of his priests to receive the imposition of hands. At the last moment the candidate took off his robes and declined absolutely to allow himself to be consecrated. Greatly put out, especially by the fruitless trouble thus caused to the venerable presiding bishop, Augustine chose in haste one of the clergy who had accompanied him to Fussala. This was a certain Antony who was undoubtedly far too young but who knew Punic—an indispensable requisite for the exercise of the ministry in this district. The presiding bishop consecrated him.

At the end of some months a chorus of complaints arrived from Fussala. The young bishop was showing himself more ready to shear his sheep than to keep them in the pastures of orthodoxy. Apart from his exactions he was charged with certain irregularities, which however were not established. Augustine did not judge that he had done enough to warrant deposition: he was allowed to retain his episcopal rank, but was compelled to redress the wrongs he had done and deprived of temporal administration. Antony discontented resolved to lay a complaint at Rome, and to this end obtained from the presiding bishop, of whose piety he took advantage, a letter of commendation for Pope Boniface. The Pope received him and gave him letters of restoration in which, however, he reserved the truth of the facts alleged to him. Antony returned to Africa, flourishing this document of revenge and uttering threats as to the secular authority. Augustine in distress consulted with the presiding bishop of Numidia. They despatched to Pope Celestine, who had just succeeded Boniface, a complete *dossier* on the subject and explanatory letters. We still possess that of St Augustine. It is as urgent as it is respectful. The Bishop of Hippo does not disguise from the Pope that if the civil police come to take action at Fussala in the name of the Roman Church he will resign his episcopal office.[1]

[1] Aug. *Ep.* 209.

Pope Celestine had succeeded peacefully[1] to Boniface (422). The latter at the time of his election was old and of weak health. Hardly a year had elapsed since his consecration before he fell seriously ill. Parties at once formed themselves again. If the Pope had died then, the schism would have begun again. He recovered. As soon as he entered on convalescence he hastened to write[2] to the Emperor and to inform him of the danger of the situation. Honorius replied with the decision that should the succession to the Pope happen to come up again and a double election take place the persons elected should both of them be eliminated. The Government would only recognize an election morally unanimous.

It might have been thought that after the two affairs of Apiarius and Antony of Fussala, which had turned out so badly for the Holy See, it would have made up its mind to leave the Africans undisturbed and not to interfere on every pretext in the details of their affairs. Nothing of the sort happened. Apiarius, removed from Sicca Veneria, had succeeded in securing acceptance by the people of Tabraca. In this new position he behaved himself even worse than in the former, to such an extent that he had to be excommunicated again. Apiarius knew the road to Rome: he set sail and went to seek Pope Celestine, then newly elected.[3] The latter sent him back with a letter to the bishops of Africa, and—a step which truly passes belief—in company with the legate Faustinus of whom Aurelius and his colleagues had had so much cause for complaint some years before. They both of them presented themselves before the plenary Council. Faustinus took up the defence of his client, asserting that he had made an appeal to Rome and that, the Pope having restored him, it was necessary to carry out his sentence, making injurious reflexions on the bishops and using very lofty language about what he described as the privileges of the Roman Church. At the end of three days of quibbling a dramatic episode occurred. Apiarius being closely pressed, at last admitted his misdeeds which

[1] However the Eulalian party had not disappeared. It appears that it profited by the death of Honorius and the usurpation of John (423) to thrust itself forward again.

[2] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 353; Coustant, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, p. 1021, where we find also the Emperor's reply.

[3] September 10, 422.

were enormous, passing belief and unpardonable. The legate, covered with confusion, saw himself compelled to abandon his deplorable *protégé*. He returned to Rome, the bearer of a letter[1] in which the Pope was exhorted not to admit with so much readiness complainants who came from Africa, all the more since the decrees of Nicæa enjoined bishops to respect the sentences of their colleagues and desired that ecclesiastical proceedings should be settled in the places where they arose. Was it held perchance that the illuminations of the Holy Spirit had been reserved for a single person and denied to great assemblies of bishops? No authentic council[2] authorized the Pope to send legates as he had done; the canons alleged to this end were not canons of Nicæa, the enquiries had clearly shown that. As for the clergy[3] delegated to secure the execution by the public authorities of sentences delivered at Rome, they entreated the Pope not to grant the position indiscriminately. In the Church of Christ one ought to act with simplicity and humility, without having recourse to the arrogant methods of the world. Lastly, now that Apiarius is definitely excommunicated for his infamous deeds they count on the wisdom and goodness of the Pope not to compel Africa to endure any longer the presence of Faustinus.

Faustinus in fact did not return any more, and we do not find that the Roman Church persevered in this campaign of trivial irritations. An organization like that of the Church of Africa, elaborated by men like Aurelius, Alypius, and Augustine, hallowed by the great service that it had just rendered in the elimination of the Donatist defection, ought not to have been attacked by petty means. If it was considered that it presented some danger to ecclesiastical unity, this ought to have been stated plainly, and an understanding arrived at with the African bishops for the removal of this obstacle. To receive complainants of any and every kind, to transform them into *protégés*, to exert all one's forces in their defence—that was a system which the old Roman republic had used

[1] *Cod. Can.* 138.

[2] If the Pope had alleged the Council of Sardica in place of the Council of Nicæa this observation of the Africans would have been of no value.

[3] These are the *defensores ecclesiae*.

and abused in order to interfere in the affairs of its neighbours. But, as the Council of Carthage said, this *typhus saeculi* was not a seemly feature in the Church of Christ. The episcopate over which Aurelius and Augustine presided was not an enemy which had to be subdued, but a force to be upheld, and in case of need directed. Zosimus, in this as in other things, had taken the wrong road: it would have been more profitable not to follow him.

CHAPTER VIII

AUGUSTINIANISM

THE secular arm did not let the Pelagians go. Pelagius himself had disappeared; Celestius, without making himself too prominent, seems to have remained at Rome or in Italy. The imperial police was active in pursuit of him.[1] But the movement soon had other leaders. They were given to it by persecution. The *Tractoria* of Zosimus had been despatched to the principal churches of the Eastern Empire, to Antioch, Egypt, Constantinople, Thessalonica, and Jerusalem.[2] It was sent also to Africa[3] and to the metropolises of the West. The Government of Ravenna compelled all bishops to sign the condemnation of the two heretics. We still possess the letter by which it invited Aurelius, the Bishop of Carthage, to secure the adhesion of all his subordinates, and that which Aurelius despatched to them in consequence.[4] It does not appear that in Africa there was any open opposition.[5] In Italy it was otherwise. The injunctions of the Metropolitan of Aquileia[6] provoked a reply emanating from a group of his suffragans and their clergy. They refused decisively to condemn the absent; in the matter of doctrine they presented a formulary[7]

[1] Quesnel's Collection, c. 16 (*P. L.* lvi., p. 493), an imperial edict of June 9, 419, which mentions another edict earlier than this one but later than that of April 30, 418; letter of the Emperor Constantius to Volusianus, Prefect of Rome, edict of the Prefect in conformity (c. 19, 20, *P. L.* lvi., pp. 499, 500).

[2] Marius Mercator, *Comm.* i. 5.

[3] Letter of thanks mentioned by Prosper, *Contra Collatorem*, 5; *cf.* Coustant, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, p. 1191.

[4] Quesnel's Collection, 16, 17 (*P. L.* lvi., pp. 493, 495); *cf. P. L.* xlviii., pp. 394, 400.

[5] See, however, Possidius, *Vita Augustini*, 18. It is not certain that the reference is to Pelagians of Africa.

[6] He bore the name of Augustine, like the Bishop of Hippo.

[7] *P. L.* xlviii., p. 509, under the name of Julian of Eclanum.

in which the principal articles of Pelagian doctrine were repudiated in the equivocal terms of which Pelagius himself did not hesitate to make use, while various ideas, rightly or wrongly attributed to St Augustine, were ruled out with a decision quite as definite.

It was in the Pope's immediate sphere of jurisdiction in particular that the scandal was notorious. In Rome itself the opposing party hid themselves, abandoned by their leaders and terrified by the attitude of the secular authority. But in Italy and in Sicily were to be found eighteen bishops firmly determined to repudiate "African dogma" and to renounce their sees rather than sign an acceptance of it. The most prominent among them, Julian, was Bishop of *Eclanum*, a place situated to the south-east of Beneventum.[1] He was not a mere nobody. His father, Bishop Memor, was united by ties of friendship with St Augustine, who wrote to him and readily sent him his books, and his African colleagues[2]; with Paulinus of Nola; with Æmilius, the Bishop of Beneventum, an ecclesiastical personage of considerable reputation.[3] Julian was destined at first for a secular career. He married young: it was Bishop Æmilius who took the chief part in the ceremony, for which the good Paulinus was kind enough to compose an epithalamium.[4] The young wife seems to have died early, for we do not hear of her later and Julian was still very young (*adolescens*) when we find him in 408 executing under his father the office of a deacon. Augustine seems to have desired Memor to send Julian to him. He did as a matter of fact spend some time at Carthage; but soon he was raised to the episcopate, perhaps[5] in succession to his father: Pope Innocent consecrated him Bishop of Eclanum.

Despite the relations of his family with the Bishop of Hippo, Julian, when the conflict occurred, did not hesitate for

[1] The modern Mirabella. The former name Eclano is coming into use again. The bishopric disappeared with the town after the Lombard conquest: it was re-established in the 10th century under the name of Quintodecimum and then of Frequentum: the see was at Frigento. To-day Mirabella and Frigento are included in the diocese of Avellino.

[2] *Ep.* 101.

[3] It was he who was in charge, in 405, of the mission sent by Pope Innocent to Constantinople to support the cause of St John Chrysostom.

[4] *Carm.* 25.

[5] It is not certain that Memor had been Bishop of Eclanum.

a moment to take sides against him. His education had been highly cultivated; he knew Greek and handled with ease the dialectic of Aristotle. That indeed was his strong point: the mysticism of Augustine found no entrance into a brain which subjected everything to reason: on the contrary he lent himself to Pelagian stoicism. He was not an ascetic like Pelagius and many of his earliest adherents. From the time of Zosimus onwards we find him becoming prominent. It was no doubt to his influence that Alypius and Augustine disputed so energetically possession[1] of the venerable Bishop of Nola. After the condemnation he wrote to Pope Zosimus,[2] adopting towards him almost the same language that the opposition in the province of Aquileia made use of, before or after him, in their dealing with their metropolitan. But the Pope's orders were precise, and since in his own metropolitical area he was himself responsible for their execution, the refusal to sign the condemnation of Pelagius and Celestius entailed for Julian and the bishops who followed him in his attitude a sentence of deposition. This was pronounced by Zosimus himself[3] in 418; eighteen[4] bishops were thus deprived of their sees, excluded from the Church and even exiled, for imperial rescripts arrived forthwith to lend support to the ecclesiastical decisions. They formed themselves into a group, not however round Pelagius who was perhaps already dead, and in any case little desirous of continuing the dispute, nor round Celestius who was not averse to doing so but who was rather a spent force. The spokesman henceforward is Julian, who was better qualified by his position as a bishop and by his literary gifts. He multiplied his activities. We find him writing to the Count Valerius,[5] who was very influential at Court, a man of great piety and much interested

[1] *Supra*, p. 164.

[2] Two letters (Aug. *Op. imperf.* i. 18); Marius Mercator has preserved to us (*Liber Subnotationum*, vi. 10-13) some passages of one of them.

[3] Augustine, addressing himself to Julian (*Contra Jul.* i. 13) says explicitly that he had been *condemned* by Zosimus himself; *cf.* Marius Mercator, *Comm.* iii. 1.

[4] It is not quite certain that the eighteen bishops were all of them immediate suffragans of the Pope. There were perhaps among them some of the opposition party of Aquileia.

[5] If it is really he who is the author of the writing referred to by St Augustine in his *De Nuptiis*, i. 2.

in all these questions; to his friends in Rome; to Rufus, the Bishop of Thessalonica; protesting against the condemnation of people in their absence, demanding instead of signatures extorted at one's home the publicity and other safeguards of a great conciliar assembly; then turning round on the promoters of the condemnation, treating them as Manicheans, as enemies of marriage, accusing them of referring to the devil one portion of the creation.

After the decisions, in conformity at last, of the Roman Church, of that of Africa and of the Government of Ravenna, Augustine might have thought that this time the cause was at an end. It was so actually at bottom; but his own task was not—far from it. It was no longer with heretics cautious and timid like Pelagius, or clumsy like Celestius, that he was now to deal. Julian's predecessors had sought by all means to secure their acceptance or toleration by the ecclesiastical authorities. It was with this end in view that they had made use of artifices, of apparent concessions, of dissimulation. Julian, deposed and exiled, had no longer anything to lose: besides, it was too late for dissimulation. The only part that remained for him to take was to represent himself as the defender of the Truth momentarily overcome, to take up again in the face of Councils, of the Pope and of the Emperor, the attitude of St Athanasius, and like him to invoke the witness of Providence which would bring everything to a successful ending by giving its revenge to the rightful cause.

Such a campaign could not be a defensive one like that of Pelagius and Celestius. To prove that one was on the side of Truth it was necessary to show that the others were in error, and it was to this that Julian set himself. The positions dealt with in the Roman decisions represented the long-standing tradition of the Church; but in Augustine's system there was something quite different, and it was possible to foresee that religious opinion would not accept everything that the illustrious bishop set before it. Julian would have had a strong case if, accepting without reserves the defeat of Pelagius and of Celestius, the necessity of Grace, and Original Sin, he had assumed the rôle in other respects of the champion of orthodoxy against African novelties. This attitude was soon to be adopted by others. But he himself essayed to discredit the traditional basis of the Augustinian teaching by any adventitious and

disputable features that it presented. It was an impossible task. Opinion underwent no change. Julian and his friends took refuge in the East, but found no support there.[1] The Bishop of Constantinople, Atticus, gave them no more of a welcome than his colleague of Thessalonica.[2] At Alexandria,[3] too, at Jerusalem and at Antioch, the doors remained closed; the Bishop of Mopsuestia, Theodore, was alone in showing them favour. He shared in reality their view; he had even written quite recently against natural sinfulness, a treatise directly aimed at St Jerome and attacking the teaching of St Augustine.[4] They made their way to him in the heart of Cilicia, and took up their quarters with him. But the group

[1] Marius Mercator (*Comm.* i. 5; iii. 1) seems fully under the impression that the *Tractoria* of Zosimus encountered opposition in none of the great churches to which it was sent. See, however, note 3, *infra*.

[2] Atticus sent to Rome official notes in which his attitude is defined (Jaffé, *op. cit.* 374).

[3] Cyril of Alexandria seems to have been in no hurry for a *personal* censure of Pelagius and Celestius. A letter in the Collectio Avellana (No. 49) gives clear enough evidence of this. It is addressed to Cyril by a certain Eusebius, apparently a bishop in Italy, who had already written to him a year earlier on this subject. Eusebius expresses astonishment that the Church of Alexandria, always in accord with those of Italy, should receive into its communion two heretics, condemned not only by the late Pope Innocent but by all the Eastern Churches. He attributes this difference of attitude to a certain Valerian, a hanger-on of the Count Valerius, who has managed to insinuate himself among the clergy of Alexandria and gives bad advice to the Patriarch. The fact that Pelagius and Celestius are represented as already condemned by "all the Eastern Churches" implies that they had all been informed of the condemnation pronounced at Rome: the letter seems then to be later than the *Tractoria* of Zosimus, although it does not mention it. Later, but how much later? If Cyril had declared himself a supporter of Pelagianism, it would have been at Alexandria without a doubt and not at Mopsuestia that Julian would have taken refuge. But it is notorious that Cyril's teaching is irreconcilable with Pelagianism, and Julian's mistrust in regard to him thus finds a perfectly natural explanation. The most reasonable assumption seems to me to be that, so far as concerned Pelagius and Celestius *personally*, Cyril showed himself as little regardful of the Roman decisions as he had been and still was in relation to St John Chrysostom. St Augustine wrote about this time to Alexandria (*Opus imperf.* iv. 88); if we still possessed his letter we should no doubt be better informed on this particular point.

[4] Πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας φύσει οὐ γνώμῃ πταίειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους: Fragments in Marius Mercator (*Symbolum Theodori Mopsuestini*, *P. L.* xlviii., p. 213 ff.) and in Photius (*Cod.* 177), who analyzes it at length and expresses greater approval of it than it deserves.

was not long in splitting up; among the earliest dissidents several rejoined the Church. In the end the movement failed and the Athanasius of Eclanum never saw the looked-for day of the *Revanche.*

At any rate he had the melancholy satisfaction of annoying the Bishop of Hippo to the very end. During the twelve remaining years of the illustrious Master's life he had unceasing trouble with Julian. The controversy opened with the first protests of the opponents. Accused by them to Count Valerius of defaming matrimony, Augustine replied by his first book, *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia.* Julian answered immediately in four books dedicated to his colleague Turbantius, who had been proscribed like himself, but who subsequently deserted him. Of these four books an epitome, very badly made, fell into the hands of Augustine; he refuted it in his second book, *De Nuptiis.* The two letters sent to Rome and Thessalonica he countered with four books addressed to Pope Boniface. When at last he obtained the complete text of the treatise *Ad Turbantium* he assailed it in his six books "Against Julian." The latter, already in retirement at Mopsuestia, became acquainted with the second book of the *De Nuptiis*: he replied in eight books, dedicated once more to one of his companions in exile—Florus. Augustine got hold of this reply and devoted to it the leisure of his last years: when death overtook him in 430, he had not completed his refutation.[1] His aim was to leave not a particle standing of the objections made to him by his opponent, and he combated him with a splendid fairness, reproducing from one end to the other Julian's actual words. It was, for a man of his age and moral position, a highly disagreeable undertaking. Julian, a controversialist through and through, adroitly laid bare the weak points of his adversary and pressed him vigorously, undeterred by any scruple of respect, inveighing at every opportunity against "the Traducian,"[2] "the Manichean," with a wearisome

[1] It is his *Opus imperfectum contra Julianum.*

[2] Traducianism is the doctrine according to which souls like bodies propagate themselves by generation. It is opposed to Creationism, which holds that souls are created directly at each generation. Augustine, according to whom Original Sin is represented by the concupiscence which accompanies generation, was inclined by the requirements of his system to the Traducianist doctrine. However, Creationism seemed to him to have a

iteration as people of this sort know well how to do. Augustine swallowed the insults, defended his teaching, put forward the texts of Scripture and ancient authors, met him face to face on all sides; but it must certainly have needed his strength of character to keep his patience.

Whilst he was expending his resources in this controversy, the Popes who succeeded Zosimus were watching over the application of the imperial laws. The Emperor Honorius died in 423 (August 27). His sister Galla Placidia, who had been for some little time on bad terms with him, was then at Constantinople, where she had taken refuge with the two children that Constantius had left her — Honoria and Valentinian. A high dignitary of the Western Empire, John, was proclaimed in Rome with the support of the *magister militum*, Castinus. Theodosius II. would have wished to be his uncle's heir, and to restore the unity of the Empire for his own advantage; but Placidia succeeded in persuading him to send her back to the West and to recognize the rights of her son, Valentinian III. After two years of "usurpation" John was removed, and the daughter of Theodosius installed herself once more at Ravenna with her children (425).

We may suppose that the Pelagians took advantage of this temporary interruption of the Theodosian dynasty for an attempt to re-establish their own affairs. It is at this moment, I think, that we ought to place a step by Celestius with a view to a revision of his case. Pope Celestine succeeded in getting rid of him.[1] The usurper seems to have shown some dislike to the clergy. One of the first acts of Placidia after her restoration was a decree by which various ecclesiastical privileges, temporarily suppressed, were again put in force. This decree,[2] addressed to the Prætorian Prefect of the Gauls, has most direct reference to certain bishops of that land who still supported the errors of Pelagius and Celestius. Patroclus, Bishop of Arles, is commissioned to inform them that if they do not amend themselves within twenty days they will be

better philosophical foundation. The result in him is a grave perplexity from which he never completely escapes.

[1] Prosper, *Contra Collatorem*, 21. One does not see how such a step could have been ventured under Honorius, or with still greater reason under Placidia.

[2] *Const. Sirmondi* 6, dated from Aquileia, July 9, 425.

removed from Gaul and their successors appointed. Sulpicius Severus, in his old age, had allowed himself to be beguiled by the ideas of Pelagius, and had defended them with the zeal which was customary to him. He recognized that he had gone astray, and thenceforward confined himself to complete silence.[1] There is no doubt that it is to the moment at which we have arrived that we ought to assign this resolution.

But there were countries where orthodoxy could not count on the support of the laws of the Empire and the severity of its police. For some years the Britons beyond the Channel, abandoned by Rome, had been living in independence. The ideas of Pelagius had, it may be, old roots among them: they spread themselves there also from abroad, in spite of all condemnations. A bishop named Fastidius, a certain Agricola, son of a Pelagian bishop named Severianus, were prominent in this propaganda.[2] Of the first of these personages we possess some writings. He was a man of character, genuinely and austerely a Christian. In the course of an expedition undertaken with his daughter and another companion he met in Sicily a great Roman lady who initiated him into the teaching of Pelagius. It was, no doubt, on his return from this expedition that he was elevated to the episcopate. With the support of persons of such respectability the new ideas could not fail to find a welcome. Pope Celestine was troubled about it. Acting on the information and advice of a deacon named Palladius, who seems to have had special ties with the churches of Britain, he made up his mind to counteract these virtuous folk by the influence of a bishop highly revered for the holiness of his life, Germanus of Auxerre. Germanus crossed the sea, accompanied by his colleague of Troyes—

[1] Gennadius, *De Viris*, c. 19.

[2] Gennadius, *De Viris ill.*, 57; Prosper *Chron.* ad ann. 429. Fastidius, according to Gennadius, is the author of a book, *De Vita Christiana*, dedicated to a certain Fatalis. This book is usually recognized in a treatise bearing the same title which is attributed to St Augustine (*P. L.* xl., p. 1031). However, Dom. G. Morin has given reasons for identifying it with the first of the six documents published by Caspari (*supra*, p. 150, note 3); as all these documents are undoubtedly by the same author, it follows that they must all be attributed to Fastidius. As for the treatise of the pseudo-Augustine, Dom. G. Morin would attribute it to Pelagius himself: it is addressed to a widow who might well be Livania, one of the correspondents of the famous monk (*Revue Bénédictine*, xv. [1898], pp. 481 ff.).

Lupus (St Loup) and commended, besides the Pope's commission, by the bishops of Gaul. His mission had good results; but it did not produce a final settlement. He was obliged to return some years later,[1] accompanied this time by Severus, Bishop of Trèves.

Pelagius, however, retained adherents in the land of his birth. When the neighbouring island, Ireland, was converted to Christianity, the British missionaries carried thither some of the doctrines censured in the Roman Empire; the name even of Pelagius appears with honour in the ecclesiastical literature and in the canon law of that country.[2] But these are belated revivals and a subject of interest only for the curious writer. In reality and immediately St Germanus gained the upper hand. The name of Pelagius may be preserved in a few manuscripts; that of the Bishop of Auxerre remained in the heart of the people. The Britons of the island attached poetical legends to it. They loved to represent themselves as having been defended by the holy man of Gaul against the Saxon invaders; they made of him a great prophet after the order of Samuel and of Elijah, able to speak to the mighty, and to call down upon their vices the chastisements of heaven. Thanks to the insular legend of St Germanus, the story of Roman Britain closes in the same atmosphere of the marvellous as that which marks the beginning of the story of Britain under the Anglo-Saxons.[3]

Germanus as the Pope's lieutenant in Britain secured the victory there of the tradition of the Church over the doctrines of Pelagius and Celestius. He had no more intention than the Pope whose commissioner he was of promulgating as a whole and in detail the Augustinian theory of the work of salvation. I have already made this distinction on several occasions: it is of more particular importance here in

[1] Prosper is witness only for the mission from the Pope at the instigation of Palladius and does not mention either a companion or a second journey. These details are derived from the *Life of St Germanus*, by Constantius, a priest of Lyons, written about 480. On this document see Levison in the *Neues Archiv.* xxix. (1904), pp. 97 ff.

[2] Letter of the representatives of the Holy See in 640 (Jaffé, *op. cit.* 2040). See also the quotations from Pelagius in the *Collectio Hibernica* and the other documents cited by Zimmer, *Pelagius in Irland*, pp. 24 ff.

[3] See my articles "Nennius retractatus" and "L'Historia Britonum" in the *Revue celtique*, xv., p. 187; xvii., p. 1.

connexion with a member of the Gallican Episcopate, that is to say of a body in which the doctrines taught from Hippo were subjected freely to examination, some being accepted, others repudiated.

At the time with which we are dealing, religious thought radiated in Gaul from two principal centres, from two asylums opened to piety on the coast of Provence, at Lérins, and at Marseilles.

To the west of the peninsula of Antibes and exactly facing Cannes, two islands rise from the blue depths of the sea. The more distant from the shore, *Lerinum*, had been laid out at the beginning of the 5th century for a colony of monks. This was conducted by Honoratus, a man of the type of Sulpicius Severus and of Paulinus, a great noble who had retired from the world, and lived a life of austerity in company with a few friends and servants. He had early bidden farewell to his family, and in company with his brother Venantius and with Caprasius, a friend of riper age, had set sail for the Peloponnese, the condition of which had become such, owing to the evilness of the times, that it was a place of resort for its solitudes. Venantius died there and was buried at Modon (Methone): the others returned to Latin shores. The bishops of Tuscany tried in vain to retain them: they met with no more success in this than had Proculus of Marseilles at the outset. The islands of the Tuscan coast were at that time greatly frequented by solitaries.[1] Honoratus gave the preference to those of his own land and installed himself at Lérins, to which he was attracted by the proximity of the saintly bishop Leontius of Fréjus. Such is the origin of the famous community of Lérins which was, for a great part of Gaul, a veritable nursery of bishops and of saints.

The community of Marseilles, somewhat later in date, is connected with the name of Cassian, a personage from the East, whom the persecution against Chrysostom had brought to Italy, and whom Proculus had succeeded in establishing in his own neighbourhood. Cassian was a native of Latin Scythia,[2] a distant province situated at the mouths of the

[1] Rutilius Numatianus, *De Reditu*, i., vv. 440-452.

[2] *Natione Scytha*, says Gennadius (*De Viris ill.* c. 62). Some ill-advised authors reject this testimony on the ground that Cassian wrote in a Latin which is more correct than could be expected of a Scythian. But there is

Danube. He had lived a long time at Bethlehem, no doubt before the arrival of Jerome, and then in the monasteries of the Egyptian Delta, and of the desert of Nitria. Shortly before the crisis which removed Chrysostom he had attached himself to the saintly Bishop of Constantinople. Exiled like him from the imperial city, but in another direction, he finally established himself at Marseilles at the tomb of a local martyr, St Victor. Patronized in its first beginnings by Bishop Proculus, this foundation was called to lofty destinies. From its earliest years the virtue of Cassian, his religious knowledge, and above all his experience of the ascetic life marked him out for attention. Cassian was speedily regarded as the legislator of the monks of the West. It was for them that he wrote, before 426, his treatise *De Institutis Cœnobiorum*, addressed to Bishop Castor of Apt, and then his Addresses (*Collationes*), the twenty-four books of which were dedicated in groups to the notabilities of the episcopate and of solitude—Leontius of Fréjus, Helladius, Honoratus, Eucherius, Jovinian, Minervius, another Leontius, and Theodosius. The last four were living in retirement in the Islands of Hyères (*Stoechadae*), whilst Eucherius was mortifying himself in the Island of Lero (Sainte-Marguerite), quite close to Lérins. Eucherius was a nobleman of Lyons, married, and the father of a family: his wife followed him to his island whilst his two sons, Salonius and Veranus, were brought up in Honoratus' monastery.

Cassian's dedications would suffice to show how close were the relations which united this whole aristocracy of Provençal piety. The populace heard tales of the holy retreats and of their inhabitants. They called them to mind at the time of the election of bishops. When Patroclus died (426), the people of Arles demanded as their bishop the founder of Lérins, Honoratus; shortly afterwards (428), for he lasted only for two years, they gave him as successor one of his disciples, Hilarius. Helladius, Eucherius, and a number of others also attained the episcopate.

It was inevitable that in such a circle[1] conflicts of opinion

no question of a Scythian (were there still any *Scythians?*); it is a question of a citizen of a Latin town of the Province of Scythia.

[1] Characterized in our day by the epithet "semi-pelagian." This term, however, ought not to be employed here. Unknown to antiquity and even to the scholasticism of the Middle Ages, it is with difficulty to be found earlier than the 17th century.

in regard to the conditions of salvation, to Grace, Free Will, and Original Sin, should excite the liveliest interest. We do not know what talk was held there before the condemnation of Pelagius: when that had been definitively pronounced, they gave it their adhesion. No one seems to have felt any difficulty in recognizing the great service that Augustine had rendered to the common Faith by interposing so energetically in this matter. All the same they did not feel themselves bound to follow him in all his deductions. The Bishop of Hippo went beyond the positions taken by the African Councils and by the Pontifical Letters. According to him, Free Will had no initiative in the work of Salvation; even the first movement of resort to God, the initial aspiration for faith, must be referred to Divine action. It was in vain that any one opposed to him the objection that if the Bible tells of startling conversions like that of St Paul, we find in it also stories like that of Zacchæus where grace follows as the sequel of a good motion, even though it be one of simple and pious curiosity. This first good motion Augustine claimed for grace exactly in the same way as that which might follow. In this he was following out the logic of his system. The human race is justly devoted to eternal condemnation. In this mass of persons under condemnation God chooses whom it pleases Him, and that without regard to merits acquired or possible. These elect persons are predestined to salvation; whatever they do or do not do, they will be saved by the power of grace, a grace admitting neither of failure (*infaillible*) nor resistance (*irrésistible*). "Help yourself and Heaven will help you," says the wisdom of the nations. "Whether you help yourself or do not help yourself," says Augustine, "Heaven will help you if you are predestined; if you are not, anything that you can do is useless." It is hardly necessary to say that in such a system God could not be considered as willing the salvation of all men. This conception to which Augustine had not been opposed in his youth was subsequently got rid of by him and with a decision that is remarkable. The text, 1 Tim. ii. 4, in which it is distinctly inculcated, is submitted by him to an exegesis so subtle and so strained, that if we were not dealing with St Augustine one would be tempted to utter the word "juggling" (*escamotage*).

That a system so pitiless should have been able to be

patronized by such a man is a thing which, at first sight, seems inexplicable. But in that day people were familiar with the ideas of Damnation, of Election, of free Predestination. They are the ground of Biblical history: Israel had always lived, was still living, under the feeling of its Predestination as a nation. The Christians, to some extent, had inherited this mental attitude. Though exaggerated and carried to extremity among the Gnostics and the Manicheans, it had in no way been detrimental to their success. Rare in the spirits of people of that time were those humanitarian conceptions which among ourselves revolt at such rigour.

Augustine,[1] for his own part, moved about his system quite unconstrained; all opportunities were good ones in his eyes for expounding it. The Roman priest, Xystus, had scarcely completed the evolution by which he transformed himself from patron of Pelagius into an opponent of the British monk, when he received (418) from the Bishop of Hippo a long letter[2] on prevenient grace and free-will. A little later Augustine was discussing the same question with a certain Vitalis, a notable of Carthage.[3] In 426 or 427 he was told that the monks of Hadrumetum were disputing among themselves on the subject of his doctrines. He interposed both by letters[4] and by the sending of two consecutive treatises, "Grace and Free Will" and "Punishment and Grace." In the latter he replied to the objection of certain monks: "Why does anyone rebuke us when we are in fault? It is Grace that has failed us." He also explains in it, more clearly than he had hitherto done, his ideas on Predestination.

Already, in the second part of his *Collationes* published about 425, Cassian had put into the mouth of a solitary of Egypt a theory of Free Will and of its part in the origin of Conversion, and this theory was in complete contrast with that of Augustine. When the book *Of Punishment and Grace*, in

[1] On what follows see the work of Père M. Jacquin, "La Question de la Prédestination aux v^e^ et vi^e^ Siècles" in the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, Louvain, 1904 and 1906.

[2] *Ep.* 194. [3] *Ep.* 217.

[4] *Epp.* 214-216. A letter of his friend, Evodius of Uzala, relative to this dispute, was published in 1896 by Dom. G. Morin, *Revue Bénédictine* xiii., p. 482. It is distinguished from analogous writings of St Augustine not by the basis of the ideas, but by a greater preoccupation with religious practice and by a more marked resignation in the presence of mysteries.

which the Augustinian system in regard to Predestination displayed itself in all its rigour became known in Provence, something like a scandal was caused. Hilary, the new Bishop of Arles, although he was on the whole a great admirer of Augustine, declared his intention of asking him for explanations. While he had not gone further than intentions, two monks of Marseilles—Prosper, an Aquitanian by birth, and another Hilary—addressed themselves directly to Augustine and did so in a very different spirit. *They* were Augustinians, without reserve or condition. Almost alone in their opinion in the circle in which Cassian and Hilary of Arles shone, they only employed the greater zeal in maintaining their ideas. Augustine, whom they invoked, came to the rescue and sent them his treatises *Of the Predestination of the Saints* and *Of the Gift of Perseverance*, two books very little calculated to allay the criticisms excited by their predecessors.

These are almost the last writings of St Augustine. Whilst he was plunging himself into these subtle questions, the world was crumbling around him. The barbarians, summoned by Roman discord, were invading Africa. Count Boniface, though a worthy man and friend of the Bishop of Hippo, adopted, thanks to Court intrigues, the attitude of a rebel. A first expedition sent against him met with no success; a second of which the Count Sigisvult, with a band of Arian Goths,[1] formed part, led him to invoke the support of the Vandals who were established in Spain.[2] Their king, Genseric, crossed the Strait of Gades (Gibraltar) in the spring of 429 with a large force. However, Boniface had ended by making his peace with Placidia[3]: he had been relieved of Sigisvult, on the assumption that he would rid himself of the Vandals. But they were in no mind to listen to the suggestion of re-crossing the sea. They were seen advancing from west to east across the Mauritanian Provinces, spreading fire and sword on every side. The Roman inhabitants fled at their approach, and sought refuge in the mountains and other protected

[1] It was with these Goths that there landed the Arian bishop Maximin. *Vide supra*, p. 121 f.

[2] In the Province of Baetica, to which their name remained (Andalusia).

[3] It was in connexion with these negotiations that St Augustine and the Count Darius as representative of Placidia exchanged some letters (Aug. *Epp.* 229-231).

posts.[1] Behind them remained nothing but ruins; churches and cities, all were gone. The barbarians from Spain were joined by the barbarians of the country, the unvanquished Moors; together they vented their fury against all that stood for Rome and leaped upon its fragments.

Soon the scourge reached Numidia. Count Boniface was beaten in the outskirts of Hippo and shut himself up in the town where he underwent a siege of fourteen months. A small number of fortified positions, Hippo, Constantina, Carthage held out for some time, and afforded a refuge for those who could make their way there and a support for the attempts at resistance.

At Hippo Possidius, Bishop of Calama, and some of his colleagues found themselves together once more in the society of Augustine. The illustrious bishop had reached the age of seventy-six. During the third month of the siege he felt his strength waning, and in the middle of the summer (August 28, 430) death laid its hand upon him. His friend, Aurelius of Carthage, too, had just departed from this world (July 20). The Church of Africa was deprived of its head and shattered: it was obliged to resign itself to the brutal oppression of the barbarian followers of Arius.

Beyond the sea this catastrophe put no check to the quarrels aroused by the sharp points of Augustinian teaching. The books on Predestination and on Perseverance had embittered men's minds. They let the fact clearly be seen, without however displaying any eagerness for written arguments in opposition to an author so highly respected. To oral objections and to those who adopted an attitude of reserve Prosper and Hilary replied with vigour pushed to the extreme. In prose and even in verse[2] Prosper proceeded to attack those whom he treated as opponents of Grace—the "ingrates," to use his own expression. Later there fell into his hands some little books consisting of collections of propositions taken either from the last works of Augustine or from his own, with the object of representing in the most unfavourable light the teaching which it was designed to decry. Vincent, a monk of Lérins, was prominent in this kind of production. He was a

[1] See the letter of St Augustine to Bishop Honoratus on the duties of the clergy in face of these enforced emigrations (Aug. *Ep.* 228).

[2] *Epistola ad Rufinum*, *Carmen de ingratis*, *Epigrammata*.

theologian of learning and not without literary attainments: his talents had attracted to him the attention of Eucherius who had entrusted him with the education of his sons. All along the coast as far as Genoa the doctrinal extravagances of Augustine were the theme of discussion. Prosper set himself to meet all comers, defending with undaunted courage, though not without attempts at sweetening, the teaching of the Master of Hippo[1] which he endeavoured to identify with that of the Apostolic See.

As a matter of fact, now that there was no longer Augustine, no longer any Councils of Africa, the only possible protection was that of the Roman pontiffs. But the latter were on the best of terms with the leaders at Marseilles. When disquiet began to be felt at Rome in regard to the heresy of Nestorius, it was not to Hippo invested by the Vandals that recourse was had for advice. It was to Marseilles, to Cassian, that the Roman archdeacon Leo addressed himself.[2] Marseilles was for the time being the home of the oracle of Western theology.

Their knowledge of this position of affairs did not deter Prosper and Hilary from repairing to Rome and invoking the support of the Holy See against Augustine's detractors. A few years before, Pope Celestine, moved by certain reports he had received, had written to the bishops of the Provinces of Vienne and Narbonne a letter of considerable asperity[3] which gave evidence of feelings of displeasure towards the monasteries of Provence and the custom which was beginning to arise of recruiting the ranks of the episcopal body from among their members. At the request of Prosper and Hilary he wrote[4] to a group of bishops of the Gauls, chief among whom figures the Bishop of Marseilles, Venerius—the successor of Proculus. In this document he expresses himself vigorously against the practice of allowing priests to preach who abuse this faculty in order to enunciate errors and to trouble people's minds. As

[1] *Pro Augustino, responsiones ad capitula Gallorum—ad capitula obiectionum Vincentianarum—ad excerpta Genuensium.* According to Père Jacquin (*Revue d'Hist. Eccl.* 1906, p. 276) the third of these works appears to be the first in date, and it is only in the following ones that Prosper began to tone down the Augustinian doctrine.

[2] Cassian, *De Incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium*, libri vii., a work earlier in date than the Council of Ephesus.

[3] *Cuperemus quidem* (Jaffé, *op. cit.* 369), July 26, 428.

[4] *Apostolici verba* (Jaffé, *op. cit.* 381).

for Augustine he declares that this man of blessed memory has always been, *for his life and his merits*, in communion with the Holy See; never has the shadow of a suspicion robbed his reputation of its radiance; his knowledge was such that the Popes who were Celestine's predecessors and Celestine himself had always ranked him among the best of masters.[1]

This document[2] was far from representing any sort of canonization of St Augustine's specific teachings. Cassian would have signed it with zest: Prosper was obliged to content himself with an oracle in ambiguous terms. Celestine, who was a very strong opponent of Pelagianism which we have seen him pursuing as far as Britain and the condemnation of which he had just secured from the Council of Ephesus, was minded to confine himself to what his predecessors had laid down without engaging in a campaign on behalf of the particular ideas of the Doctor of Hippo.

On July 27, 432, Celestine died and was immediately replaced by Xystus, the former protector of the Pelagians. The latter must have been a man of a very taking kind, for Prosper notes in his *Chronicle* that he was elected amidst the greatest calm and with a wonderful unanimity.[3] Such an election was not calculated to awaken hopes in the followers of Augustine. Prosper none the less continued his campaign. He even ventured to attack Cassian and his "Conferences" point-blank, setting himself to prove that anyone who reflects upon the teaching of Augustine is only a Pelagian in disguise. He would have been very glad to involve the Pope in his campaign. "The Divine protection," he says, "which operated in Innocent, in Zosimus, in Boniface, in Celestine, will operate also in Xystus. The other shepherds have driven away wolves who are manifest as such: he for his part will have the glory of driving away those whose character is hidden." These hidden wolves are people like Cassian, Vincent, Hilary of Arles, and

[1] Augustinum sanctae recordationis virum pro vita sua atque meritis in nostra communione semper habuimus, nec umquam hunc sinistrae suspicionis saltem rumor adspersit; quem tantae scientiae olim fuisse meminimus ut inter magistros optimos etiam ante a meis semper decessoribus haberetur.

[2] The letter *Apostolici verba* must be separated from an appendix which the MSS. usually present after it, the *Auctoritates de gratia Dei*, with which we shall have to deal presently.

[3] Totius urbis pace et consensione mirabili.

Faustus, who had been treated from the outset as hypocrites and as mad dogs.[1]

The exhortation missed its mark. Pope Xystus took no part. Cassian, secure in his established reputation, did not deign to reply. At Lérins Vincent published in 434 his *Commonitorium*, one of the most famous books in Christian antiquity. Neither Prosper nor Augustine are mentioned in it by name; but it is clearly as an attack on the Master at Hippo that such stress is laid on the spirit of innovation, on the example of Origen and on the necessity of confining oneself to doctrines hallowed by a continuous and universal tradition. It is in this work that there appears the well-known adage, *Quod semper*, *quod ubique*, *quod ab omnibus*, and it is against St Augustine that it is there directed.

At Rome, too, people were to be met with who, while not unmindful of the recent condemnations, were trying to save what could be saved of Pelagianism and were very far indeed from following Augustine to the extreme limit of his theories. It is from this circle that there come down to us various writings, probably due to the same author[2]—the Conflict of Arnobius and Serapion, a Commentary on the Psalms, a work entitled *Praedestinatus*—all of them having very little that is Augustinian about them, although we find on occasion high eulogiums upon St Augustine.[3] Predestination, handled very severely in the Commentary and ignored in the Dialogue of Arnobius and Serapion, is attacked in the *Praedestinatus* in an ingenious form. First we are given a list of ninety heresies plagiarized for the most part from a similar work of St Augustine's. The eighty-eighth is the heresy of Pelagius, then comes that of Nestorius, and last that of the *Praedestinati*.

[1] *Contra Coll.* 21.

[2] This is the opinion of Dom. G. Morin (*Revue Bénédictine*, 1909, pp. 419 ff.), and I am much inclined to think that he is right. The Dialogue of Arnobius and of Serapion belongs to the last years of Pope Leo, certainly later than 454: the *Praedestinatus* is older, anterior to the affair of Eutyches, of the time of Xystus III. or the first years of Leo: the Commentary may go back to a still earlier date.

[3] "Ea quae eius *nunc* profero, ac si sacratissima Apostolorum scripta sic credo et teneo et defendo" (*Arnobii Conflictus*, ii. 30; Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* liii., p. 314). A passage of St Augustine follows in which is maintained the ordinary doctrine on the necessity of grace, without any feature specially "Augustinian."

In connexion with Pelagius and Celestius the story of their condemnation by Pope Innocent is told: the principal points of their doctrine are indicated, with the objections from the side of orthodoxy, all in a highly pacific tone. As for the heresy of the *Praedestinati*, it is represented by a sermon which was circulating, we are told, under the name of Augustine and which develops, while exaggerating them beyond all measure, the salient features of his teaching on Predestination. Then follows a formal refutation. This strange book[1] seems certainly to be the work of some one of these concealed Pelagians, a species which was far from having disappeared from Rome and from Italy. It is even possible that its appearance was not unconnected with a step taken about 439 by Julian of Eclanum in regard to Pope Xystus III. In spite of all the condemnations which had fallen upon him in the course of the last twenty years, Julian had not lost hope of recovering his bishopric. He addressed himself to the Pope with a pretence of having returned to orthodox views. There were signs of a willingness to listen to him; the disciples of St Augustine were beginning to tremble, when the deacon Leo, an adviser who stood high in favour, intervened with Xystus III. and Julian was shelved.[2]

From all this no very clear indication could be gained as to the doctrinal attitude of the Holy See. Pelagius and Celestius, who had been condemned in the time of Innocent and of Zosimus, were now abandoned by everybody. But people who were at one in including them in the number of the heretics were far from agreeing among themselves on the details of their own orthodoxy. A document[3] of this period, which is Roman in origin and which we have every reason to attribute to the deacon Leo, gives us as it were a first attempt to define the position of the Roman Church. It is in the main that which will be maintained in the course of ensuing controversies. In this it is stated first that certain persons who make no difficulty in anathematizing Pelagius and Celestius reproach "our masters" with having gone too far in refuting

[1] Hans von Schubert, *Der sogenannte Praedestinatus* in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. xxiv. 4.

[2] Prosper, *Chron.* ad ann. 439.

[3] *Praeteritorum sedis apostolicae episcoporum auctoritates de gratia Dei*, printed at the end of Celestine's letter, *Apostolici verba.*

these heretics and declare that they confine themselves to what the Apostolic Pontiffs have decided. The next step is to enquire what the latter have defined, and along with them the African Councils which have been approved by them. From the point of view of the insufficiency of Free Will, the necessity of Prevenient Grace and of the gift of Perseverance, the doctrine expounded is that of St Augustine and not that which was propagated in Provence. As for irresistible Grace and Predestination there is no mention of them. There is even expressed an unwillingness to enter upon certain questions which are specially profound and difficult.[1]

This composition was not, so far as we know, the subject of a formal promulgation: it remained in the position of a document of weight and authority. The Provençals cannot have been entirely satisfied with it: their views on Prevenient Grace were excluded rather than approved. However, the refusal to enter upon certain questions and the silence preserved in regard to Predestination were not likely to be displeasing to them. Prosper held his peace. His opponents, while still holding their own opinions, seemed to have moderated the expression of them. For the moment the controversy was lulled.[2]

[1] Profundiores vero difficilioresque partes incurrentium quaestionum, quas latius pertractarunt qui haereticis restiterunt [*sc.* Augustine], sicut non audemus contemnere, ita non necesse habemus adstruere.

[2] This does not mean that people refrained from reflexion and writing on these questions. Two anonymous works belonging to this period have been preserved—the *De vocatione omnium gentium* (Migne, *P. L.* tom. li., p. 647) and the *Hypomnesticon contra Pelagianos et Caelestianos* (*P. L.* tom. xlv., p. 1611), which give us different attempts to resolve the problems of Predestination. In the first, often attributed to the deacon Leo, the starting point—assumed as indisputable—is the fact that God wills the salvation of all men—an idea which has very little that is Augustinian about it—and this is reconciled as best may be with the irresistible efficacy of grace (*gratia specialis*) and the doctrine of Predestination. The other treatise explains Predestination by the aid of a distinction of great subtlety: it is not sinners who are predestined to punishment; it is punishment which is predestined for sinners.

CHAPTER IX

ATTICUS AND CYRIL

ARCADIUS died on May 1, 408. He left a son of seven years old, Theodosius II., and three daughters,[1] Pulcheria, Arcadia, and Marina. The first was only two years older than her brother. From these nestlings born in the purple no governor was to be obtained for the State. And so Honorius, the uncle in the West, formed a project of intervention. His powerful minister, Stilicho, was already making preparations for the journey to Constantinople when differences arose between them; before the month of August was ended Stilicho was no more. Shortly afterwards Alaric appeared in Italy and provided the Emperor Honorius with the most serious reasons for not going away. New Rome, besides, could do without the West. Over the young imperial family there kept guard a man of honour, alike intelligent and strong—the Prætorian Prefect, Anthemius: he undertook the Regency and administered it with ability. In his counsels he had the sophist Troilus, a man of considerable repute, and the Archbishop Atticus,[2] one of the cleverest men of his time. The young Theodosius already[3] bore the title of Augustus: it was also conferred upon Pulcheria when she entered her sixteenth year[4]; and from that time she was qualified to take part in the direction of affairs. She did not marry, nor did her sisters. They lived, all three of them, in the

[1] Another, the eldest, whose name was Flaccilla, had died before him.

[2] Atticus was a native of Sebaste in Armenia. He had lived there for a long time among the monks of the celebrated Eustathius (see Vol. II., p. 304 f.), monks who belonged to the "Macedonian" belief. He subsequently joined the Catholic Church (Sozomen, *H. E.* viii. 27).

[3] He had been proclaimed on January 11, 402.

[4] July 4, 414.

imperial palace a life of austerity and piety, in as much retirement as their position allowed. Brought up with them, and to some extent by them, Theodosius II. was a mild and religious prince, of highly cultivated mind and little inclined for warlike adventures. Under his rule the Empire of the East enjoyed a tranquillity both without and within which the West had every reason to envy. Ways of escape were found without the sacrifice of honour from the difficulties unceasingly recurring on the Persian frontier. As for the barbarians on the Danube they were kept at a distance successfully for the most part either by means of money or by the devices of diplomacy. Within the Empire the peoples seem to have profited, so far as their material prosperity was concerned, by the benefits of peace. Constantinople grew in size day by day. Anthemius carried out the enclosure of a whole series of suburbs which had grown up around the old town. This was the Theodosian enclosure which after many restorations still marks the bounds of Old Stamboul. The enclosure of Constantine was demolished, but its line remained indicated by columns. It was a religious frontier. Heretical dissenters, especially those who were Arians, could not have churches within the wall of Constantine: they were not thrust back beyond the Theodosian wall; but they were compelled to remain outside the columns, and hence the name *Exokionitai*.

The Patriarch Atticus seems to have been at bottom fairly tolerant of heretics, albeit he sometimes addressed to them resounding threats. The Novatians especially had reason to congratulate themselves on his administration. To the former sects there was now added the group of faithful supporters of Chrysostom—the Johannites, as they were called. They were very numerous, and the Patriarch observed with regret that his own churches were sparsely attended, whilst mysterious gatherings, held on the outskirts of the capital, collected veritable crowds. The enthusiasm of the dissenters was sustained by the steadfastness of so many bishops whom they knew to have been persecuted and exiled for the good cause, and also by the moral support of the Pope of Old Rome. After Chrysostom's death and undoubtedly on the accession of Theodosius II. the tension was relaxed. On the advice of Theophilus himself, Atticus showed himself more yielding and thus regained a large number of dissenters. But there remained

a large body who still refused all intercourse with him, and the schism continued equally in the populace of Constantinople and in the episcopate.

Theophilus, contented with having destroyed his rival and asserted his own dominating influence in the religious affairs of the East, was in no way anxious to perpetuate ecclesiastical quarrels around himself. Origenism had ceased to interest him. It was with the utmost tranquillity of soul that he endured the interruption of his relations with the Roman Church. Being well assured that the protests of Rome and of Ravenna would have no effect at Constantinople, he enjoyed in peace his power in Egypt and his influence beyond its borders.

Among the provinces immediately subject to his authority, Libya Cyrenaica, of which much had been heard in the 3rd century in connexion with the heresy of Sabellius and in the 4th in connexion with Arianism,[1] provides us in the time of Theophilus with a figure as original as it is attractive, that of Bishop Synesius.[2] Scion of a noble family for whom his erudition traced a connexion with the Dorian kings the sons of Heracles, he had received in the schools of Alexandria an education of the most superior kind. In the first rank of his teachers figured the celebrated Hypatia, who was then the director of the Neoplatonist school and for whom he always retained, even after his elevation to the episcopate, the most tender and most grateful veneration. When barely twenty-five years old he was entrusted (*c.* 400 A.D.) with the conduct of a deputation of his fellow-citizens to Constantinople. During the long stay that he made in the capital he had an opportunity of seeing Chrysostom, Eutropius, and Gainas. On returning to Alexandria he married. Theophilus, with whom he was acquainted, blessed the union. Then he retired to his country-side, holding himself as far as possible aloof from public affairs, devoting himself to bodily exercises, especially to the chase, and never ceasing to cultivate his mind. Poet, orator, philosopher, an astronomer at a pinch and a geometrician, he was interested in everything. We possess writings of his in these various

[1] Vol. I., p. 350; Vol. II., pp. 103, 122.

[2] On the chronology of Synesius see the memoir of Otto Seeck in *Philologus* (1893), pp. 442 ff.

fields, and notably letters in a style at once vivid and of considerable refinement. In religion he was a Neoplatonist slightly tinged with Christianity. With the Pope Theophilus he maintained friendly relations, but his intellectual sympathies attached him by preference to the circle of Hypatia.

In this way he was leading a life of pleasing tranquillity when about the year 410[1] the people of Ptolemais made up their minds to elect him Bishop. There was sufficient ground for dismay. Religion, and especially theology, had scarcely troubled his attention hitherto: he was a very tyro in it. What was more, to say nothing of religious ceremonies, a bishop was absorbed from morning till night in the care of his flock. He had to judge them, to administer them, to relieve their various miseries and to help them in everything. In short, Synesius saw himself compelled to live solely for others. What an upsetting! A picture rises before our minds of Ausonius invited to accept the episcopal office. Finally there were dogmas and canonical ordinances with which he would not easily come to terms. They would not secure from him a literal acceptance of the doctrine of the resurrection of bodies in the sense in which the common people understood it, nor the abandonment of his wife, nor his hope of still having children. In regard to all this he wrote an open letter[2] to his brother Euoptius, and in it the Patriarch Theophilus was strongly urged not to ratify the election. But Theophilus was easy-going at times. We do not know to what extent Synesius caused him to accept his programme: the fact remains that in the end he was consecrated Bishop of Ptolemais. In this unexpected position he had, luckily for himself, no dogmatic difficulty to settle: in the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Alexandria, ordinary bishops had not to trouble themselves about these things. But Libya was not secure against the scourges, within and without, which were desolating all the provinces. It was suffering under bad officials and under barbarians. Synesius found himself at

[1] The chronology of Synesius and that of his letters is not very easy to fix. However, he was most probably ordained in 411, after more than seven months of hesitation (*Epp.* 13, 95). According to O. Seeck (*Philologus*, vol. lii., pp. 460 ff.) we should put this back to the year 407; but that is irreconcilable with Letter 66.

[2] *Ep.* 105.

close quarters with both, and the traces of it have remained in his picturesque correspondence.

The children of the desert, Maketes and Ausurians, were beginning terrible forays in the coast region.[1] Synesius demanded adequate troops and experienced leaders: for his own part he mounted guard on the walls of his episcopal town. Almost as formidable as the brigands of the interior, the Governor Andronicus[2] was afflicting the province by his extortions and his cruelties. Synesius did not hesitate to excommunicate him: at the same time he exerted himself at Constantinople to get rid of this venal magistrate. He succeeded, and Andronicus fell into disgrace. Then we find the good-hearted Synesius, forgetful of his grievances and his excommunications, undertaking the defence of his luckless adversary. Synesius was not bishop for long: he must have died about the same time as Theophilus, for in his letters[3] he never mentions his successor Cyril. The faithful friend of Hypatia had not the sorrow of hearing of her tragic end. Outside his distant province and certain literary circles, Synesius does not seem to have been widely known. From the other side of the Delta, other voices secured a better hearing: they were, it is true, voices of authority, voices of men of God—those of Isidore of Pelusium and of Nilus the Sinaite.

The latter was a former official of Constantinople. He had retired with his son Theodulus to the rude solitudes of Sinai, and lived there for a long time protected from the world, but not from Saracen robbers. Theodulus was carried off by them, and it was only after many adventures that his father succeeded in finding him again.[4] Isidore was an Egyptian of good family who ruled over a monastery in the outskirts of Pelusium. Both of them were men of great culture: they had left behind them in the world a large number of ties; their sanctity, which was eminent and celebrated, brought them many others. They were counsellors, spiritual directors, for the whole Empire of the East. Nilus left many ascetic writings for the special use of monks. Of each of them there

[1] He often speaks of them in his letters (59, 69, 88, 123), and especially in his discourse called "Catastasis."

[2] *Epp.* 57, 58, 72, 73, 79, 89.

[3] *Ep.* 12 is addressed to a Cyril; but it is certainly not the Patriarch.

[4] Vol. II., p. 407, note 3.

remains an enormous quantity of letters, for the most part preserved only in extracts. Nilus was a great admirer of Chrysostom: he would not allow that anyone should be scandalized at his statements, even the most vehement of them.[1] Isidore, for whom the Bishop of Constantinople was the Master *par excellence* in exegesis and in theology, did not hesitate to side with him against Theophilus and to stigmatize energetically the proceedings of the Bishop of Alexandria: "Egypt, forever the enemy of Moses, forever attached to Pharaoh, has let loose against the saintly doctor this Theophilus, this man whose besetting passion is gems and gold: he has associated with himself four accomplices, four apostates like himself:[2] together they have 'downed' Chrysostom."[3] It is surprising that, though adopting a style of this sort, Isidore had not had to suffer from the revengeful Patriarch. Cyril also received from him admonitions in severe terms. In short, if all those whom he taught their duty had risen against him, he would have had to go through some very unpleasant times. Priests, bishops, monks, provincial officials, great men of the Court, all were rebuked with the most complete freedom: the Emperor himself, the pious Theodosius II., did not escape the strictures of the saint of Egypt. But it was to the clergy of Pelusium especially, and in particular to their head, Bishop Eusebius, that his invectives were devoted. This Eusebius seems to have lived to a great age in spite of Isidore's hostility: we come across him again at the time of the Monophysite quarrel in which he played an evil part.

At Bethlehem in his restored monastery Jerome was watching the approach of the end of his long career. The Pelagians, his last opponents, were stinging him still by their writings. A certain Annianus of Celeda,[4] who at the time of the Council of Diospolis had acted as a sort of secretary of Pelagius, was attacking the Letter to Ctesiphon and the Anti-Pelagian Dialogues. Jerome proposed to administer sound punishment to him; but he was prevented from doing

[1] *Ep.* i. 309.

[2] The three Syrians—Acacius, Severian, and Antiochus—and Cyrinus of Chalcedon.

[3] *Ep.* i. 152.

[4] Ceneda in Venetia? He translated into Latin several homilies of St John Chrysostom.

so by the death of Eustochium, which plunged him into sorrow both prolonged and deep. His prostration betrays itself in the last letter that he wrote to his friends in Africa, Alypius and Augustine.[1] From that time forward, too, it was on the Bishop of Hippo that he relied to continue the struggle and to secure the final defeat of the heretics. He himself was too old: he felt it.

Eustochium did not leave him alone in the world. The young Paula remained with him, and also the devout family of the Caelian Hill—Melania, her mother Albina, and the excellent Pinianus. Peace had been concluded between Bethlehem and the Mount of Olives: the grandchildren of the first Melania fraternized with those of the first Paula. Together they received the last roarings of the old lion: Jerome died on September 30, 420.

At Antioch, so long as Porphyry lived, that is to say till about the year 414, Chrysostom's opponents waged against his memory the war that they had levied against his person. In succession to Porphyry there was elected a former monk, Alexander, a man of peaceful views. He showed these in the first instance in relation to the remnants of the Little Church, who, though deprived of a bishop after the death of Evagrius, continued none the less in their attitude of schism. It was indeed a bright day when Bishop Alexander went with his own people to fetch the old believers in their church at the Southern gate, and led them all to the great cathedral of Constantine, with their voices united at last in the same psalmody.[2] Alexander did not stop there: he replaced in the diptychs the name of Archbishop John, and thus regained all those who had taken sides at Antioch against Porphyry. The priests and other clergy of the two dissenting groups were received into the number of the conforming clergy. Two bishops, Helpidius of Laodicea and Pappus, who had been removed from their sees for their adherence to Chrysostom, were also restored. Finally, Alexander despatched to Rome and secured the presentation to Innocent of the records of these two reunions. The Pope was highly

[1] *Ep.* cxliii. We do not know if he was acquainted with the book written against him by Theodore of Mopsuestia (*supra*, p. 185). He nowhere mentions it.

[2] Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 35.

pleased with them, and communion was re-established between the two sees of St Peter.[1]

The Bishop of Antioch exhibited the greatest possible zeal. In the course of a journey that he made to Constantinople we find the people stirred up to demand the insertion of the name of John in the diptychs, in spite of the opposition of Atticus. The latter held his ground: for the moment nothing was changed. At Antioch, too, a reaction was not slow in taking place: Theodotus, Alexander's successor, effaced John's name once more. Opinion in Syria remained seriously divided. The aged Acacius of Berœa, tenacious in his hate but embarrassed by the fervour of John's followers, shuffled painfully between the two parties. Under Bishop Alexander he had submitted to a reconciliation with the Roman Pope and had taken the steps necessary to secure it. He would greatly have preferred that Theodotus should stand firm in his new attitude; but the people of Antioch had had enough of these quarrels of bishops: they compelled their Patriarch to pronounce in the holy mysteries the name of the illustrious bishop, their fellow-countryman, the glory of their city.

It only remained to secure the acceptance of this surrender alike at Constantinople and at Alexandria. Acacius undertook the task and wrote to the two Archbishops. At Constantinople the letter which was disclosed to the populace threw it into a ferment. Atticus made up his mind to placate it. He negotiated matters with the Court, replaced John in the list of his predecessors, and everything was settled.

Things did not move so quickly at Alexandria. Theophilus had died in 412. To his last hour he remained unbending, troubling himself very little about Roman protests. The Council of Africa made an attempt in 407 to intervene in this dispute and to reconcile Rome with Alexandria: it was sheer waste of energy. Isidore of Pelusium made his plaint in vain: no attention was paid to him. Synesius, who had small comprehension of these unbridled hatreds, was of opinion that since John's death at any rate they had no longer any ground for existence[2]: they let him talk. Even the death of the obstinate Patriarch brought no change.

[1] For the Papal letters relating to this business see Jaffé, *Regesta*, 305-310; their date is about 415 A.D.

[2] *Ep.* 66.

He was as a matter of fact replaced by his nephew Cyril, in whom there lived again all his own qualities, both bad and good. Like Theophilus Cyril was a man of great ecclesiastical learning and a spotless life: like him also he showed himself daring and hard. The terror which the Patriarch of Alexandria inspired around him and in the whole of the East was not relaxed for a moment. Cyril soon gained at Constantinople the reputation of being a formidable person. All that was heard of was his conflicts with the Augustal Prefect, Orestes. The reason of their estrangement we do not know. It was perhaps due to an attempt on the part of the imperial authorities[1] after the death of Theophilus to run a candidate in opposition to Cyril. Whatever may be the fact as to its causes, this resentment showed itself on all possible occasions. One day when the Prefect was settling some police business relating to the Jews and their continual tumults, the Jews recognized among the crowd present a schoolmaster named Hierax, a fanatical admirer of Cyril and leader of the "claque" at his sermons.[2] They proceeded to treat him as an *agent provocateur*, a fosterer of disturbances. The Prefect suspected that Hierax had been sent to spy upon him and caused him to be publicly chastised. In anger, Cyril summoned the heads of the Jewish nation and uttered terrible threats in case their disturbances continued. The bishop did not, of course, possess any power capable legally of repression; but he held the populace in his hand; a sign from him could let loose a tumult. The Jews formed the shameful project of taking the initiative and organizing under pretext of a fire an affray by night. In this they killed a large number of Christians. At daybreak the secret plot was discovered by the latter. Cyril let them loose upon the synagogues, and this was the end of the Jewish colony at Alexandria: it was dispersed, and its possessions and those of its members were given over to pillage.

We can imagine whether the Prefect Orestes was glad to live in contact and in conflict with this force of revolt. Cyril

[1] Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 7, mentions here not Orestes but the military commandant, Abundantius.

[2] The evil custom of applauding preachers was tolerated at that time. Naturally enough the applause came to be organized into a system under the direction of interested parties.

became, in his eyes, more than a public enemy—a personal opponent. It was in vain that attempts were made to reconcile them. Cyril, it was reported, lent himself to an advance: he appeared in the Prefect's presence with the Book of the Gospels in his hands. What has he to say to him as a commentary on this display? As a matter of fact the Prefect remained unyielding.

In the number of Cyril's supporters there figured the solitaries of Nitria. The execution of the Origenists had put an end to their dissensions: the Patriarch now held them under his hand. One day the Prefect met in the street a band of five hundred monks who had lately arrived from the desert. Their intentions were hostile. They began to assail him with invectives and to treat him as a heathen. It was in vain that he protested that he had been baptized at Constantinople, by Archbishop Atticus. A monk named Ammonius threw a stone at him which made his head bleed. The monk was at once arrested and put to the torture, and so acutely that he gave up the ghost. Cyril provided him with solemn obsequies, pronounced a funeral oration upon him, and ordered that he should be regarded as a martyr.

Among the people who enjoyed the favour of the Prefect figured the illustrious Hypatia, a woman of high literary distinction, as much renowned for her personal character as for her ability. She was still a heathen, and directed the Neoplatonist school. Orestes was not the only Christian of note who held her in esteem. We have seen above with what veneration Bishop Synesius regarded her. In Cyril's *entourage* she was regarded as the instigator of all the evil designs of the Prefect. It was she, they asserted, who prevented him being on good terms with the Bishop. One day a band of fanatics led by a certain Peter, one of Cyril's Readers, laid wait for her, pulled her from her carriage and dragged her into the church of the Cæsareum. There she was stripped of her garments and battered to death with tiles: she was then torn to pieces, and her poor remains were burnt in a cannibal-like orgy. This took place in the month of March 415.[1]

[1] The accounts given above are told us by Socrates. They represent the reports credited at Constantinople and so admit a certain measure of exaggeration. However, the impression which results from them cannot be disregarded, for it agrees only too well with what other documents of a

Such was the *milieu* into which the wise-heads of Antioch and Constantinople had to endeavour to introduce counsels of moderation and readiness to forgive. They took a very humble tone.[1] Acacius adduced the disturbances at Antioch, Atticus those at Constantinople: one of them spoke of the reluctance of Theodotus, the other of his own. Atticus appealed to the feelings of the Court, and declared that John had been placed upon a list on which there were not only bishops but also clergy of lower rank and lay folk, both men and women: he said that after all the Arian Eudoxius rested in the same burial-place as the orthodox bishops of Constantinople. It was not easy to delude Cyril in the matter: he was an authority on diptychs, and had no difficulty in establishing that on those of Constantinople John occupied an honourable place in the number of the bishops and not among the laity. But John had been deposed from the episcopate: he was no longer a bishop. To restore him in this fashion, said the Bishop of Alexandria, was to replace Judas in the Apostolic College. It was his uncle, Theophilus, who had presided over the Council of the Oak: he himself was present at it[2]; he knew at first hand what had taken place there. They would not obtain the concession either from him or from the Egyptian Episcopate which was behind him to a man.

We do not know what was the result of this business. That Cyril ever replaced John in the diptychs of Alexandria is a conclusion for which there is no evidence whatever; but whether he eventually made up his mind to it or they ceased to press for the step, the fact remains that relations were renewed between the great Churches.

The Pelagian business which made a stir in Palestine about the time that Alexander, the Bishop of Antioch, was rehabilitating the memory of Chrysostom, did not affect their intercourse. The condemnations in the West were observed everywhere except at Mopsuestia, in Cilicia, as we have seen above. The Patriarch Atticus had no intention of allowing

less questionable kind tell us with regard to the character and proceedings of the terror-inspiring Archbishop.

[1] The letter of Acacius is lost, but Cyril mentions it in his *Ep.* 76, by which he replies to that of Atticus. (*Ep.* 75. Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, tom. lxxvii., pp. 347-360.)

[2] *Ep.* 33.

himself to be drawn into this dispute. This does not mean that, even after he had been reconciled with the Popes, he showed any great deference towards them. We find him, on various occasions, setting himself in opposition to their claims relative to the higher control of the Episcopate of Illyria, which he was endeavouring to attract within his own orbit. This attitude, natural enough on the part of the Bishop of Constantinople, was in no way peculiar to Atticus.

The Messalians continued to give the prelates of the East reasons for anxiety similar to those which the Priscillianists and the Manicheans aroused in their colleagues of the West. Atticus was compelled to devote his attention to these curious sectaries, who were always very popular in certain districts of Asia Minor. They did not cease to increase in numbers, and cared nothing either for ecclesiastical sentences or for the imperial laws which proscribed them. In Pamphylia, and in the neighbouring regions of Lycia and Lycaonia, and as far as Cappadocia, they made themselves heard of incessantly. It seems clear that they were strong enough to intimidate the bishops, for again and again the shepherds have to be recalled to the necessity of exercising severity against these intractable sheep. Atticus set himself to do so,[1] and so did his successors after him. The Bishops of Antioch were not less active.[2] Archelaus of Cæsarea in Cappadocia condemned twenty-four propositions in which the Messalian teaching was summed up: his suffragan, Heraclidas of Nyssa, published two letters against the sectaries. Finally, the Council of Ephesus, at the request of the Bishops of Iconium and of Side, delivered a new decree against the heretics.[3]

For all that they were not rooted out. Some thirty years after the Council of Ephesus, one of them, a certain Lampetius, imposed upon the good nature of Alypius, the Archbishop of Cæsarea, and secured ordination as priest. Prosecuted by an

[1] Letters to the Bishops of Pamphylia and to Amphilochius, Metropolitan of Side (Photius, *Cod.* 52).

[2] Letter addressed to the Metropolitans of Perga [Beronician] and of Side [Amphilochius] by Sisinnius of Constantinople, Theodotus of Antioch, and the other bishops gathered together for the ordination of Sisinnius; letter of John of Antioch to Nestorius (*ibid.*).

[3] *Ibid.* Of all this literary material which Photius had before him there remains only—and that in a Latin version—the decree of the Council of Ephesus (Act. vii., Mansi, *Concilia*, tom. iv., p. 1477).

Archimandrite, Gerontius, he was deprived for offences against the ordinary law, but none the less retained considerable influence within his own circle. The Messalians, or at any rate a section of them, were called after him Lampetians. Even as far as Egypt he found champions: Alfius, a Bishop of Rhinocorura, and a priest of the same name were deposed as partisans of Lampetius. He was the author of a book called *Testament*, which was refuted by Severus, the Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, before his elevation to the episcopate.[1]

The sect diversified itself still further, under other leaders and other designations. The title of Marcianites, which we find from the close of the 6th century, came to it from a banker named Marcian, a contemporary of Justinian and of Justin II.[2] In Armenia, too, the Messalians caused scandal and incurred ecclesiastical condemnations.[3] They seem to have been absorbed in the 7th century by the sect of the Paulicians.

Amongst the people upon whom the Messalians' way of life and their constant prayer exercised a powerful attraction, we find in the early years of the 5th century a certain Alexander, a man of great reputation in the deserts of Syria and as far as Antioch.[4] He had many disciples to whom he gave a three-fold rule: absolute poverty, abstention from work, and incessant application to prayer. Some of them were collected in monasteries: with others, who formed sometimes bands of considerable numbers, he wandered about on pretext of evangelization in the solitudes which bordered on the Euphrates, as far as Palmyra and the Persian frontier. At Edessa he converted a magistrate of influence, Rabbula, who later became a bishop. Sometimes he appeared at Antioch where the authorities, both ecclesiastical and military, looked upon him with no favourable eye. In this way he came into

[1] Photius, *ibid.*

[2] Timothy, a priest of Constantinople, Περὶ τῶν προσερχομένων τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ (Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, tom. lxxxvi.[1], p. 45).

[3] See on this Ter-Mkrttschian, *Die Paulikianer* (Leipzig, 1893), pp. 39 ff. It is possible that the Malpatus referred to in a letter of Isaac of Nineveh (Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, tom. viii.[3], p. 184) is connected with an Edessene incident in the history of this sect. *Malpatus* has been connected with *Lampetius*.

[4] Life of Alexander (*Acta Sanctorum*, January 15); Life of St Marcellus (Migne, *P. G.* tom. cxvi., p. 709).

contact with Bishops Porphyry and Theodotus: the latter took steps to get rid of him, and Alexander fled in secret to Constantinople.

There he established himself near the Church of St Menas, and his propaganda, to which he devoted himself without delay, had such success that more than three hundred monks abandoned their convents to put themselves under his direction. The superiors protested; the populace rose; an enquiry was instituted into the antecedents of the new-comer; he was put on trial before a synod which seems to have been held in 426, in the presence of Theodotus of Antioch, a person who was at once hostile and well informed. To cut the story short, Alexander was recommended to return to Syria. Though roughly treated on the journey by the Bishop of Chalcedon he was well received on the other hand by Hypatius, the superior of the monastery of *Rufinianae*. Permission was obtained for him to remain in the neighbourhood. He withdrew into retirement on the Asiatic side of the Strait in a solitude called Gomon, exactly at the point where the Bosphorus debouches into the Black Sea. The community formed itself once more in this asylum, and by relaxing its observances at length secured toleration. The old monks had very little liking for the abstention from work. From the height of his Sinai St Nilus fulminated[1] resolutely against the idleness which was inculcated both by Adelphius the Mesopotamian and by "this Alexander who has lately troubled Constantinople." Alexander is here in bad company, for Adelphius, who is mentioned with him, was one of the founders of the Messalian sect.[2] However he was able to die in peace in his convent at Gomon. After his death the Congregation transferred itself, keeping to the same shore of the Bosphorus, to a place called *Irenaeon* (Tchiboukli) which was nearer to Constantinople. This was the Monastery of the *Akoimetoi*[3] to which its second abbot, St Marcellus, gave high distinction. It played a part sometimes in great religious concerns. The name *Akoimetoi* (those who do not sleep) is derived from the fact that neither day nor night did prayer cease in the oratory

[1] *De Paupertate* (Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, tom. lxxix., p. 997).

[2] Vol. II., p. 462.

[3] As to this see Pargoire, "Un Mot sur les Acémètes" (*Echos d'Orient*, vol. ii., pp. 304, 369).

of the Irenæon, the monks dividing themselves in groups by relays to keep up a perpetual chanting of psalms. Under this form, the fundamental observance of the Messalians succeeded in acclimatizing itself in the Church. The *Akoimetoi* soon became very popular: several monasteries of Constantinople adopted the *laus perennis;* it even made its way to the West.[1]

Monasteries were multiplying themselves at Constantinople and in the suburbs. The first and the most ancient had been founded under Theodosius, round the hermitage of the famous monk, Isaac,[2] by Dalmatius, an officer who had been converted to the strict observance. Other monasteries, notably that of Dius, dated back almost to the same time. From the beginning of the 5th century these foundations became very numerous. Isaac, always alive and always active, displayed an extraordinary zeal in multiplying them. In all he was considered as a sort of common ancestor. Beyond the Bosphorus the most ancient colony of monks had been organized by the minister Rufinus at the church of his villa — that renowned Villa of the Oak where several councils were held. Rufinus' monks had come from Egypt: after some time they returned there. In the church there was to be seen besides the tomb of the founder that of one of the celebrated Tall Brothers, Ammonius Parotes.[3] In the time of Arcadius a Phrygian monk called Hypatius came to the place from the Thracian convent of Halmyrissos,[4] and after one or two tentative efforts established in it a community of importance. This Hypatius of whom we possess an adequate biography[5] was, like many of the solitaries, *difficile* enough in temperament. Quarrels often occurred between him and Eulalius, the Bishop of Chalcedon, as for example on the day when he gave shelter to Alexander the Akoimete, who had been cudgelled by the Bishop's people. A Prefect of Constantinople on one occasion formed a project

[1] We know that it was introduced into the monastery of St Maurice of Agannum (St Maurice).

[2] Vol. II., p. 332; *supra*, pp. 54, 63. On "Les Débuts du Monachisme à Constantinople," see Pargoire in *Revue des questions historiques*, vol. lxv. (1899), p. 67.

[3] Supra, p. 66.

[4] This owed its foundation to a certain Jonas who came from Roman Armenia: it is mentioned in the Life of Hypatius.

[5] By one of his disciples called Callinicus (*Acta Sanctorum*, June 17).

of renewing at Chalcedon the festival of the Olympic Games. Despite the Bishop's explanations Hypatius declined to see in these games anything but pagan ceremonies: he roused all the monks in the neighbourhood, and in the end frightened the Prefect who was obliged to abandon his schemes and re-cross the Bosphorus. Some considerable time before the Council of Ephesus Hypatius had declared on his own account that Nestorius was a heretic and had erased his name from the diptychs.

It was not only at Chalcedon that the monks showed themselves a source of annoyance to the clergy. For the Archbishop of Constantinople himself, the exalted pontiff of New Rome, they cared no more than for any casual bishop. Chrysostom reckoned them among his most determined opponents. If they were on friendly terms with Atticus who had been on the same side as themselves at the Council of the Oak, Nestorius soon had them against him, and so did Flavian and Anatolius. The Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon (451) had reason to complain of their insolence.

Throughout the whole of the East the popularity of monasticism as an institution led to the multiplication of foundations and the complication of relations. Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem surrounded themselves with colonies of ascetics. In ordinary times the result was a good deal of edification; but there were moments of crisis, and then we shall speedily find the monastic element playing in them a more definitely pronounced part than hierarchical authority would have desired. In the suburbs of Antioch among several solitaries whose life has been described to us by Theodoret[1] who knew them in most cases, the great celebrity was Simeon Stylites. Simeon[2] had at first been a shepherd and then a monk in a monastery; but his taste for austerities of the minutest kind pushed to inordinate extremes rendered him unsuitable for life in a community, and he made up his mind to live alone engaged in appalling exercises, passing whole Lents without eating or drinking, keeping himself erect for days and weeks, and at last caused himself to be attached by an iron

[1] "Historia Religiosa" (Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, tom. lxxxii.).

[2] Theodoret, *op. cit.* c. 22, an account written in the lifetime of Simeon, who indeed survived his biographer. On the other lives of St Simeon Stylites see the memoir cited in the next note.

chain fixed in the face of a bare rock. At the suggestion of an ecclesiastical dignitary he finally gave up his chain; but it was only to imprison himself in another way, for he caused a column of masonry to be built for himself, climbed to the top of it,[1] and took up his abode there. He justified this strange home on the ground of the impossibility that he had found of escaping from the importunity of the visitors whom the fame of his penance had caused to flock to his desert. The column was at first about ten feet high: in course of time it was gradually raised. Theodoret saw it when it had reached a height of about sixty feet. It was aloft on this that Simeon received visitors.

The other monks began by taking offence at this unusual practice. From Nitria there came very energetic censures[2] of it. But Simeon was a man of such simplicity and goodness, of character so unalloyed, that they were really obliged to allow him his pillar. Besides it was protected by a popularity which knew no bounds. The saint was talked about not merely in the Roman East but as far as Rome itself, where his picture was in all the shops, as far as Gaul and Paris, to which commercial relations brought a large number of Syrians. Geneviève of Nanterre, the famous Virgin of Paris, exchanged compliments with the Saint of Antioch. Caravans carried his name to the Ethiopians, throughout the whole of the Persian Empire and farther still to the country of the Turks.[3] But it was in his immediate neighbourhood above all that his authority as an ascetic extended its influence in all directions. The Bedouins of Syria and of Mesopotamia flocked around him. Upon these children of the desert he produced the impression of a celestial Being. He used to make speeches to them in a style that they could understand. Theodoret was sometimes present at these extraordinary prophesyings. One day Simeon fixed on him as priest for his Arabs and told them to ask for

[1] On the Pillar Saints (*Stylitae*) see the admirable work of Père H. Delehaye, *Les Stylites*, in the "Compte-rendu" of the third Congrès scientifique internationale des Catholiques, section v., p. 191.

[2] Theodore the Reader, ii. 41. In the collection of the letters of St Nilus there are two documents (ii. 114, 115) addressed to a Stylite called Nicander for whom he shows little consideration. There is difficulty in accepting the authenticity of these letters. In the time of St Nilus († 430) Simeon seems most probably to have been the only one of his kind.

[3] Modern Turkestan.

his blessing. They flung themselves upon him with such impetuosity that he would have been smothered, had not the saint from the top of his column checked them by his cries.

The instructions which Simeon addressed to such hearers were, as one can well imagine, somewhat elementary in their theology. This did not hinder them from having recourse to his elucidations in difficult problems. Simeon and two of his brother ascetics were consulted, in 458, as to the advisability of upholding the definitions of Chalcedon. On this question all the provincial councils of the East had been invited to express their views. Simeon, simple man as he was, was treated as though he were a council. His death in 459 was an event of the most far-reaching effect. He was taken down from his pillar, and his body, after being solemnly transported to Antioch, was laid to rest in the principal church. The pillar was preserved: it was surrounded with an enormous octagonal piazza on the sides of which were built four great basilicas. The imposing ruins of these buildings and even the remains of the pillar can still be seen in the district of Kalaat-Semaân (Castle of Simeon) between Antioch[1] and Aleppo.

[1] Vogüé, *La Syrie centrale*, p. 141, plates 139-151. The place was formerly called Telanissos, and this name is preserved in the modern one, Tell Neschin. Evagrius had seen this monument and describes it, *Hist. Eccles.* i. 13. *Cf.* Lebas and Waddington, *Voyage archéologique*, vol. iii. 2691, 2692.

CHAPTER X

THE TRAGEDY OF NESTORIUS

THE Patriarch Atticus died on October 8, 425. Save for his hostility towards St John Chrysostom we have little but good to say of his administration. He was a good ecclesiastical leader, pious, intelligent, and above all able to deal with a situation and conciliatory in temper. He had known how to settle the business of the Johannites and to steer clear of any kind of compromise with the Pelagians. His church lived in almost undisturbed peace and his relations with other churches outside it were not less satisfactory. He was favourably regarded at Rome, and even at Alexandria he was forgiven for having half rehabilitated John, and they refrained from taking any steps in opposition to him. Besides, to have done so would have been a rather dangerous enterprise, for Atticus as a cautious man, in favour at Court, and fertile in resource, was not an easy person to tackle.

On his death the sympathies of the clergy were divided between two candidates—two priests, Proclus and Philip. The former had been his secretary[1] and was an orator of distinction. The other, a native of Side in Pamphylia, was rather a man of learning, of the muddled kind. He was engaged upon a great *History of Christianity* which has not come down to us.[2] Whilst these two candidates were being mooted, the voice of the people made itself heard to demand an old priest of the suburbs,[3] Sisinnius, a man widely known for his piety and his charity, a person of simple character and average education. He was enthroned. Philip returned to his studies, and as for Proclus he was consecrated by the new Patriarch bishop for the metropolitical see of Cyzicus. The town of Cyzicus was in the "Diocese" of Asia, and the question might be asked whether

[1] Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 41. [2] Vol. II., p. viii, note 1.
[3] The suburb of Elea, the modern Pera.

the Patriarch was really within his rights in sending it a bishop. The jurisdiction and privileges of the Bishops of Constantinople as regards the provinces on the other side of the Bosphorus had not yet been defined by Councils. An imperial law (νόμος) had laid it down, so it would appear, that the people of Cyzicus could not elect their bishop without the advice of Atticus.[1] At Cyzicus people were convinced that this privilege, as being personal to Atticus, could not authorize his successors to interfere in their elections. When Proclus went to take possession of his see, he found it occupied by a certain Dalmatius,[2] who had been elected and consecrated without reference to the Bishop of Constantinople. The situation was such that he thought it advisable to take what had befallen him with patience: he returned to the capital where he found an occupation as a preacher.

Sisinnius lasted only for two years: he died at the end of the year 427. Once more the supporters of Philip and Proclus loudly urged their claims. The Court did not think that the state of feeling was such as to justify it in upholding one of the parties against the other: it made up its mind to choose a new bishop outside the ranks of the clergy of Constantinople. There was much talk at Antioch about a priest called Nestorius who was superior of a monastery[3] close to the town. Commended by the austerity of his life, he also enjoyed a reputation for eloquence: his sonorous and well-modulated voice and his easy elocution attracted hearers.

When installed in the see of the capital he disclosed himself from the outset as a great slasher of heretics. In his inaugural sermon (April 10, 428) he promised heaven to the Emperor on condition that, by his agency, the earth were purged of all religious dissent.[4] "With me, Sir, overthrow the heretics; with you I will overthrow the Persians." So far as the heretics were concerned these were not empty words. The Arians had succeeded, in spite of the laws, in retaining a chapel in the old town of Constantinople. Nestorius discovered it: five days

[1] Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 28. [2] Vol. II., p. 111, note 1.

[3] In the 6th century it was called the monastery of Euprepius (Evagrius, *H. E.* i. 7).

[4] A statement related by Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 39, no doubt with a little exaggeration; but at bottom it is nearly enough in the style both of the time and of the man.

only after his consecration the police went to close it. The Arians in exasperation set it on fire, and the flames spread to the neighbouring houses. The Quarter was burnt, and people began to treat the bishop as an incendiary. The Government supported him in his campaign: at his request a law of great harshness[1] renewed the old prohibitions and made them more definite. Fortified by this new document the Patriarch set himself to take proceedings against the Novatians, the Quartodecimans, and the Macedonians. The Quartodecimans were numerous in Lydia and in Caria, and offered resistance. Sardis and Miletus were drenched in blood by risings. In the Province of the Hellespont there were still "Macedonian" communities who went back to the time—now distant—of Eleusius.[2] Nestorius harried them, aided upon the spot by the Bishop of Germa, a certain Antony. The victims of oppression took their revenge, and Antony was assassinated. This was the end of the Macedonian schism. An imperial decree deprived them of the church which they still possessed at the gate of Constantinople, of the one which they held at Cyzicus, and some others in the villages of the Hellespont.

Nestorius did not meet with the same success in his measures against the Novatians. They succeeded in maintaining themselves in the good graces of the Court; and the Court defended them against the devouring zeal of the Patriarch. Besides, this scourge of the heretics was about to become a heretic himself. Here we have the beginning of a tragedy alike lamentable and involved.[3]

We have seen above[4] that at Antioch ever since the time of the Emperor Valens there had been considerable discussion as to the relations of the Divine element in Christ with His human element (*forma Dei*, *forma servi*). Apollinaris and his party endeavoured to establish between these two elements a unity

[1] *Codex Theodos.* xvi. 5, 65 (May 30, 428). [2] Vol. II., p. 343.

[3] The writings and fragments of Nestorius have been collected and edited with care by Loofs, *Nestoriana* (Halle, 1905), with the exception of the "Book of Heraclides," which is preserved in Syriac. For the latter see the end of the next chapter. As for the documents relating to this affair, they are annexed in the collections of Councils to the Acts of the Council of Ephesus in 431. Upon the special collection entitled the *Synodicon*, see the note at the end of the present chapter.

[4] Vol. II., pp. 470 ff.

of nature, in which one of the two—the human element—was partly sacrificed. According to this theory, the Person of the Divine Word had united to itself, not an individual man nor even all the components of humanity, but simply an animate body which it directed by fulfilling in it the functions of the Intellect. There were not two Persons but one only—that of the Word: there were not two Natures but one only, the Divine Nature, conceived, however, as possessing human aptitudes corresponding to the functions of the body and of the living soul: "One is the Incarnate Nature of the Divine Word."[1]

Apollinarianism had been repudiated from its first appearance at the close of the 4th century. Under Theodosius it was officially classed among the heresies, and the ecclesiastical associations attempted by its supporters were proscribed by law. At the same time as Apollinarianism, a system in an opposite sense had been condemned by Pope Damasus,[2] and this condemnation the Episcopate of the "Orient" had confirmed. From that time forward it was understood that one ought not to speak of "Two Sons," the Son of God and the Son of Man, as though one were speaking of two distinct individualities. Thus care was exercised upon this point.

However, we must note that if the Council of Antioch in 379—accepting *en bloc* the decisions of Pope Damasus—had repudiated at the same time Apollinarianism and the doctrine of the Two Sons, Apollinarianism alone had been aimed at in the Council of 381, which was held under the direction of the Bishops of Syria. Diodore of Tarsus, one of its most prominent leaders, seems often to have left out of sight the criticism directed against the "Christ in two Persons," and the same held good of his friend Theodore of Mopsuestia. Men were still groping. On neither side did they hold the solution of the problem. From the one side equally with the other the quest was pursued, starting from imperfect conceptions, and, as

[1] Μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη, *Una natura Dei Verbi incarnata.* This celebrated formula, common to the Apollinarians and the Monophysites, was adopted also by the Church, but not without difficulty and with explanations which modified its original meaning.

[2] Anathematizamus eos qui duos Filios asserunt, unum ante saecula et alterum post assumptionem carnis ex virgine (Coustant, *Epp. Rom. Pont.*, p. 512). *Cf.* Vol. II., p. 327, note 2.

always happens in polemical disputations, instead of making an attempt to correct its own system each cared for nothing so much as criticizing that of the others, and pushing it to ridiculous conclusions.

The efforts which were being made to arrive at greater clarity were directed by the tradition of the New Testament, by the Gospel history in its entirety, and pre-eminently by the famous text of St John: "The Word was made flesh." They were inspired also by a mystical conception according to which the salvation, or even (according to some) the Apotheosis of humanity depends upon the extent to which this was penetrated in Jesus Christ by Divinity Incarnate. It was sought then so to constitute the Christ that the Man should enter into Him in absolute completeness, and also that in Him the Man should be joined in the closest possible union with the Divine element. But according as anyone concerned himself to a greater or less extent with one or other of these conditions he found himself led to different solutions. At Antioch the opponents of Apollinaris could not easily reach a conception of the human element in Christ as deprived of individuality; not only did it imply body, soul and intellect, but it "was in itself": it was a man, a human hypostasis. Since, on the other hand, the Word was a Divine hypostasis, it follows that in Christ there are two hypostases. The difficulty lay in defining the union of these two hypostases in such a way as to obtain a single Christ.[1] The result was secured as best they could, especially from Diodore and Theodore, for more and more the necessity was felt of getting rid not only of the idea of Two Sons but of two distinct subjects. The Divine Word is "the same" who is Man, the same and not another. Such, in spite of certain expressions and conceptions more or less unfortunate, was the underlying principle of the speculation of the theologians at Antioch at the moment when our narrative begins.[2]

[1] A single Christ: this was at Antioch the most usual formula. With it they parried the argument drawn from the Creed of Nicæa according to which the Birth, Death, and Resurrection are attributed to the same Person who is God of God, etc. Yes, it was answered; but this Person is from the outset described as Christ and as Son of God: we do not deny either the unity of Christ or that of the Son of God.

[2] The unfortunate term "Hypostasis," from which so many difficulties had already arisen in the Trinitarian controversies, still retained its

The theologians of Cappadocia—Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa—following in this the path laid open by St Athanasius, had leaned in the opposite direction. Preoccupied before everything else with the idea of the unity of Christ, they made it as intimate as possible, incorporating after a fashion in the Divine Hypostasis incarnate all the constituents of humanity, and in order to this incorporation sacrificing the human personality of Jesus Christ. In this way the "Hypostatic" union was reached; and there was even a tendency towards the "physical" union, in the special sense of which these words are capable for us, for the distinction of "phusis" and "hypostasis" was not as yet well established.[1] They had thus a Christ who was perfectly One, as in the system of Apollinaris, but more complete from the point of view of the human elements than the Doctor of Laodicea had conceived. The awkwardness of his system was, if not entirely removed, at any rate greatly diminished. To the Christology of the Cappadocians is allied that which we shall find propagated at Alexandria by Cyril and his disciples.

In these two opposed schools the tools of debate were almost exclusively the metaphysical notions of Nature and Hypostasis. In the West there had already been introduced into the Trinitarian problem a notion of a different order—that of Person—a notion of an ethical and quasi-juridical kind. One and the same Divine Nature possessed by Three Persons

ambiguity. At Antioch it did not signify much more than the Latin word "Substantia"—its liberal representation, and scarcely differentiated itself from *οὐσία* (essence) except that it excluded the idea of abstraction, and expressed that of concrete existence. It is necessary in our estimate of the documents of this period to avoid giving it the definite sense that it now has in the language of theology.

[1] On neither side was there a clear notion of the difference between a complete nature and an hypostasis. Cyril and his party objected to the employment of the term "Two Natures" which seemed to them identical with that of "Two Hypostases," and compromising to the unity of Christ. In this we have the beginning—still orthodox—of *Monophysitism*. The Easterns were "Diphysites," as was also the Council of Chalcedon; but at the time with which we are dealing they were so with a touch of exaggeration, at any rate in expression. At bottom every one was in agreement as has several times been shown, and quite lately by Père Joseph Mahé (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, vol. vii., pp. 505-542). Bar-Hebraeus in the 14th century already took this view (Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, tom. ii., p. 291).

—it was thus that they reduced to order the apparently contrary data of Three-foldness and Unity; it was thus that a reconciliation was effected between the tradition of the Gospel and the Monotheism of Scripture and of philosophy. From this combination between notions of so different an order there did not flash forth any increase of light; it was rather calculated to maintain, if not to increase, the judicious obscurity which is appropriate to these mysterious subjects. The service which it had thus rendered in relation to the Trinity, it rendered also in relation to the Incarnation. Two Natures, a Single Person: such was the Latin solution. And it was a solution inherited from tradition: from the time of Tertullian that was the current form of expression.[1]

By Nature was meant not at all the same thing as in the Schools of Alexandria or in those of Antioch. The human element in Christ as it was conceived in the West was more complete than in the sense given to it at Alexandria, less complete than what was admitted at Antioch. In the West it was a true Nature, capable of volition and of action according to the method of its faculties: in Alexandrian usage it would rather produce the effect of a group of faculties without activity apart from the Divine nature to which they were attached: when the Antiochene party speak of it one is always led to fear that they have in their minds the idea of an individual man.[2] The Alexandrian formulas—"Physical" union, "Hypostatic" union, "Single" nature of the Incarnate Word—were scarcely in concord with those of the West: the latter agreed better with the language of Antioch — Two Natures, One Person. However, we must not attach too much

[1] Tixeront, *Histoire des Dogmes*, vol. i., p. 343.

[2] Between the Alexandrians and the Easterns of the 5th century—both of them orthodox but in a different fashion—there was a relation analogous to that which we have noticed in the century before between St Athanasius and St Basil on the question of the Trinity. Athanasius knew quite well that though he spoke of Three hypostases Basil was at bottom of the same opinion as those who held but One. They came to an understanding. The difference between the two situations—from the theoretical point of view negligible but important for the historian—is that in the 5th century people who thought the same, though one side spoke of One Nature and the other of Two, did not succeed in tolerating each other and treated each other roughly. In the midst of their conflicts we seek in vain for a man capable of dominating and pacifying them: there is no longer an Athanasius.

importance to this external agreement. The indefiniteness of the terms caused persons of little familiarity with the subject to pass easily from the Two Natures to the Two Persons, and the Eastern doctrine by this method of interpretation to assume discreditable resemblances to that of Photinus and of Paul of Samosata. They defended themselves against this, no doubt; but the impression remained.

It may be seen, from the little that it is possible for me to say here, how delicate and difficult these questions were. Since the curiosity of man whetted itself upon the mystery of Christ, since the unwisdom of the theologians kept upon the dissecting table the sweet Saviour who offered Himself for our love and our imitation far more than for our philosophical investigations, at the least it was requisite that these should be conducted in a peaceable manner by men of acknowledged competence and discretion, far aloof from the crowd and from bickerings. It was the contrary that happened. The unleashing of religious passions, conflicts between metropolitical sees, rivalries between ecclesiastical potentates, noisy councils, imperial laws, deprivations, sentences of exile, tumults, schisms —such were the conditions under which the Greek theologians studied the dogma of the Incarnation. And if we look to the result of their quarrels, we see at the end of the vista, the Eastern Church irreparably divided, the Christian Empire dismembered, the lieutenants of Mahomet trampling under foot Syria and Egypt. Such was the price of these exercises in metaphysics.

The general body of the faithful had lived up to that time, as it lives still in our own day, on the primitive idea of the Man-God: Jesus Christ is God; He is Man also. In the Gospel history, according to its current interpretation, the miracles and other superhuman manifestations were attributed to His Divine power: the humiliations, the sufferings, the death to His human weakness. In all good faith expressions were used such as *Homo dominicus*, *Deus natus*, *Deus passus*,[1] which involved a mixing, a fusion of the two elements, Divine and human, which in one sense or another would have gone somewhat beyond the lines, had they been already fixed, of the language of orthodoxy. It was one of these expressions—that of "Mother of God"—which let loose the storm. This designation,

[1] *Qui natum passumque Deum . . . credit*—an inscription of Damasus.

employed earlier, without insistence and equally without hesitation, by authors of widely different opinions, was tending to pass into the language of devotion. More and more the veneration of the faithful was directing itself towards the Mother of the Saviour. In the East the custom[1] arose of calling her "Theotokos" (Θεοτόκος), "Mother of God." Such language in no way offended either the ideas of the Alexandrians or those of the Latins. "Who (*Quis*) was born of Mary?" they asked themselves. Clearly the Divine Word, that is to say God. This "that is to say" on which the legitimacy of the term *Theotokos* is based, was objected to by the Christology of Antioch and not without reason. The expression "Mother of God" is orthodox only if we understand it of God-Person: understood of God-Nature it is more than heretical, it is absurd. Mary, according to orthodox tradition, is Mother of One who is God; she is His Mother, not that He owes her His Divinity but because He has taken from her His humanity. The term *Theotokos*, then, needed explanations. If it had been an unambiguous term it would not have given rise to so much conflict.

It appears that even before the time of Nestorius there had already at Constantinople been disputes in this connexion. Apollinarians were not wanting in the capital, nor persons who, without being Apollinarians, whether avowedly or in secret, professed on the subject of the Incarnation views that were hostile to the theology of Antioch. Eutyches, who made so much stir later, was already a well-known personage, of great influence in the monastic world. The previous bishops had had the wisdom not to mix themselves up in these disputes. Nestorius with his fierce zeal for orthodoxy threw himself into them recklessly. According to him the term "Mother of God" went too far: it appeared to imply that the Divinity of Christ has its origin in Mary, and thus to make of a woman a being anterior to and, in a certain sense, superior to God. It would be better to adopt the designation "Mother of Christ." The term "Christ" denoted two elements at once—one Divine, the other human; the Motherhood of Mary attached itself naturally

[1] St Gregory of Nazianzus does not hesitate to launch an anathema against those who do not recognize Mary as Mother of God: Εἴ τις οὐ Θεοτόκον τὴν ἁγίαν Μαρίαν ὑπολαμβάνει, χωρίς ἐστι τῆς θεότητος (*Ad Cledon. Ep.* I) [*Ep.* 101].

to the human element. It was answered that the danger he feared was absolutely chimerical, no one being such a fool as to believe that God *qua* God was born of a woman. It was further urged that the human element of Christ coming to belong to the Divine Word, it was certainly the Divine Word who, *according to the flesh*, was born of Mary. These disputations were endless and embarrassing: they were talked of everywhere.

The new Patriarch had brought from Syria a certain number of clerics,[1] whom the native clergy only half liked. One of them, a priest Anastasius, set himself to preach[2] against the *Theotokos* and thus evoked protests. The Bishop intervened and in every connexion spoke in the same sense. It seemed that he had no longer any other subject for a sermon. The opposing party did not scruple about interrupting: they pretended to believe that Nestorius, a fellow-countryman of Paul of Samosata, had fallen into his heresy. A poster[3] was stuck upon the wall at St Sophia: on it the teaching of the new Bishop was compared to that which the Council of Antioch had condemned 160 years earlier. The author of this exaggerated and unjust manifesto was a pleader called Eusebius, who later became Bishop of Dorylæum. The monks began to excite themselves and excited the people: the Patriarch was exposed to insults and avenged them with some brutality. One day a deputation of monks betook themselves to him. Nestorius gave them a very bad reception. He

[1] Mansi, *Concilia*, tom. iv., p. 1109.

[2] Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 32.

[3] Mansi, *op. cit.* tom. iv., p. 1008. The comparison of the theology of Nestorius to that of Paul of Samosata has found other expressions. Not to speak of Cassian and his *De Incarnatione*, it is worth while to mention a false letter of Dionysius of Alexandria to Paul of Samosata (Mansi, *op. cit.* i., p. 1039; *cf.* Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, tom. xxviii., pp. 1559, 1565) in which this distant predecessor of Cyril discusses in detail the theology of Theodore of Mopsuestia and of Nestorius, deemed to be defended by the bygone Bishop of Antioch. The refutation is made from the Apollinarian or Monophysite standpoint. Bonwetsch, the latest to devote his attention to this document (*Nachrichten* of the Royal Society of Göttingen, 1909, pp. 123 ff.), thinks that it is specially aimed at Nestorius. It would then be necessary to place it at the time at which we have arrived. But it seems to me that there is occasion for further study of it before accepting too definite solutions. The letter of the pseudo-Dionysius belongs to quite a collection of Monophysite forgeries which ought to be examined with it.

himself also came from a monastery; but at the present time he deemed himself the hierarchical authority: the protesters had reason to know it. Taken before his judgement seat, thrown into the prisons of the episcopal palace, delivered over to the scourge of the apparitors, the monks could appreciate the distance that separated them from their Patriarch and the inconvenience that attached to meddling with his theology. Holy men never pardon these things: Nestorius had been very unwise.

He was so in all respects and on all occasions. Not content with preaching in every connexion the disturbing Christology of Antioch and with issuing Charges against the *Theotokos*, he gave the widest publicity to his sermons of the past and to those of the present. He sent them as far as Rome: at Alexandria, also, people were not slow in making their acquaintance.

From the point of view of Rome[1] he made haste to commit the last of imprudences—that of patronizing the Pelagians.

After the death of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Julian of Eclanum, with three other Italian bishops, Florus, Orontius, and Fabius—all that remained of the dissentient band of 418—had taken refuge at Constantinople. Shortly after was seen the arrival of Celestius himself, one of the two original heresiarchs. They presented themselves to the Bishop in the guise of orthodox folk who were persecuted in their own country and compelled to make their way to the presence of the Emperor. Nestorius could not be ignorant of the identity of these well-known personages, nor of the reason why they had had difficulties with the religious authorities of the West. None the less he thought it incumbent on him to write to Pope Celestine letter after letter[2] asking for information on this matter. In this connexion he informed him of his conflicts with a local body of opponents who, so he said, attached themselves to the proscribed views of Apollinaris and of Arius. Such a comparison has just about as much value as that by which the adversaries of Nestorius were endeavouring to compromise himself with Paul of Samosata.[3]

[1] At the time of his enthronement he had exchanged letters with Celestine (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 374; Coustant, *Epp. Rom. Pont.*, p. 1115).

[2] Coustant, *op. cit.* *Caelestini Epp.* vi., vii., pp. 1075, 1079.

[3] However, we must not forget that Eutyches and other persons of this shade of opinion were already figuring among the opponents of the Patriarch.

Celestine, disturbed by this business, felt the need of consulting with people acquainted with the facts. The war with the Vandals separated him from Augustine. The Roman deacon Leo addressed himself to Cassian of Marseilles, who lost no time in sending him a "Consultatio" in seven books, extremely unfavourable to the views of Nestorius.

The theology of Antioch could not fail to be familiar to a man who had lived so long in the East. Cassian, however, had recently had an opportunity of refreshing his memory in regard to it. A monk of Trèves,[1] named Leporius, had maintained in Provence views fairly closely resembling those which were exciting people's opposition at Constantinople. According to him the Divine Word was one [person],[2] the man Jesus another. The latter by his virtues had merited closer and closer union with the Divinity, and had in fact attained it. It was the old theory of Adoption, the theory of Christ becoming God by progression, but it was combined on the other hand with the doctrine of the Word as personal and divine, a doctrine which since the definitions of the 4th century could no longer be neglected. Leporius, condemned by the bishops of the Gauls, and notably by the Bishop of Marseilles, crossed over to Africa, where he found something better than condemnations: Aurelius and Augustine showed him that he had made a mistake and led him to sign a public retractation.[3] We can see from this document how little opinion in the West was disposed to follow Nestorius and other representatives of the theology of Antioch in the campaign which they were waging at Constantinople. The point in their theory which was fastened on above everything else, and which shocked people extremely, was the idea of the man Jesus as "other" in relation to the Divine Word, in relation to the subject of the Incarnation, and assuming from the fact of this distinction the appearance of the Christ of Paul of Samosata and of Photinus.

Whilst Cassian was preparing his reply to the Pope's

[1] Ex maxima Belgarum urbe (*Contra Nestorium*, i. 2).

[2] Ἄλλος, not ἄλλο. These matters are so subtle that even in French one cannot succeed in stating them with clearness. Greek only is an adequate instrument for the purpose.

[3] Mansi, *Concilia*, tom. iv., p. 519: Fragments in Cassian, *De Incarnatione*, i. 5.

enquiry, a Latin who was settled at Constantinople—Marius Mercator, a disciple and admirer of St Augustine,[1] was setting himself on the track of Julian and his supporters. A memorandum (*Commonitorium*),[2] sent by him to the Church of Constantinople, to the monasteries, and to the Emperor (429), was a timely reminder to these different authorities of the legal position of the appellants. They were expelled from Constantinople. The attitude of Nestorius in this matter is a highly equivocal one. He made enquiries of the Pope as to the culpability of Julian, he wrote to Celestius[3] to support him, and for all that he was to be found preaching in his church against Pelagianism.[4]

Marius Mercator had perhaps some commission from Pope Celestine to keep an eye upon matters of religion at Constantinople. But other eyes besides his were open to them: the secretaries of Cyril were following the smallest steps of the indiscreet Nestorius, and keeping the Pope of Alexandria informed. To him from the very first day the new Bishop of Constantinople had been suspect. Again a man of Antioch, another John! Soon Cyril perceived the flaw in the harness. Nestorius, like his predecessor, was possessed of an eloquence which was copious, eager, and aggressive. But, more readily than he, Nestorius quitted the domain of ethics, for incautious and unskilful thrusts in the hazardous sphere of theology. His opinions displeased a great number of people and prejudiced them. It would not be long before they would gain points of attack upon him which they had not had against the two preceding bishops. Cyril, like his uncle Theophilus, was a finished theologian. A disciple of Athanasius and the Cappadocians, he was also a disciple of Apollinaris, but without realizing it. Like many other people he had read the Apollinarian books which were in circulation under names regarded with the highest respect. In this way he accepted, with complete good faith, as those of St Athanasius, Popes Felix and Julius, and St Gregory Thaumaturgus, methods of reasoning and Biblical interpretations which came direct

[1] Aug. *Ep.* 193.
[2] We still possess it (Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, tom. xlviii., pp. 63 ff.).
[3] *Patrol. Latina*, tom. xlviii., p. 181.
[4] Sermons preserved by Marius Mercator, *ibid.* pp. 189 ff.

from Laodicea. Such, in particular, was the *provenance* of his famous formula: "One is the Incarnate Nature of the Divine Word." He adopted it, he clung to it, welded himself to it, with invincible obstinacy. And this was, for the peace of the Church, a grave misfortune.[1]

Anchored to a very narrow notion of the unity of Christ and moulded by deep reflexions upon theology, Cyril was further possessed of an enormous store of Biblical learning and of a facile pen—one too facile, indeed, for he does not escape from verbosity. Such were his intellectual resources. As for his energy and his *savoir-faire* he had already given proofs of them. Nestorius had to deal with a formidable opponent.

The rumours caused by the first sermons of the new bishop were transmitted forthwith to Alexandria. A collection of his Homilies was already being talked of. At the beginning of the year 429, Cyril was conscious of a certain disquietude on the subject in the solitudes of Nitria: without waiting any longer and affecting to believe that religious peace was threatened at home, he wrote[2] a long letter to the monks of the desert. This no doubt reached them, but it was for Constantinople that it was specially intended: the bishop's opponents turned it to their advantage. Wounded at this interference, Nestorius preached against the letter and caused it to be refuted by one of his priests who was named Photius. Whilst these replies were on their way to Alexandria, Cyril, who had been informed of the resentment of Nestorius, wrote him the first of his letters.[3] In this he threw back upon him the responsibility for the difficulty introduced into their relations, and for the disturbance which was beginning to show itself at Constantinople and elsewhere. He knows already, and tells his brother-bishop so, that his Homilies are very unfavourably regarded at Rome. Let Nestorius cease to attack the *Theotokos* and peace might be made.

[1] There is reason for surprise that he should have delayed so long to write formally in opposition to the theology of Antioch. Instructed as he was and versed in the literature of these questions, he could not be in ignorance of the writings of the famous Diodore of Tarsus and certainly not of those of Theodore of Mopsuestia with whom he was on good terms and who even dedicated to him one of his works (his Commentary on Job). Theodore was only just dead (428). His ideas were known everywhere in the East.

[2] Cyril, *Ep.* 1. [3] *Ep.* 2.

In spite of this exchange of unacceptable comments, relations were not yet such that it was impossible for Nestorius to reply to Cyril. He did so[1]; but the situation was destined to become more strained.

There were at Constantinople some Alexandrian clergy who had been deprived by Cyril for certain misdoings: they made strong complaints against him alike to the bishop and to the magistrates. Nestorius affected to interest himself on their behalf. A priest named Philip,[2] who held schismatic assemblies and whom Celestius had accused of Manicheanism, had been deposed after trial.[3] Cyril when informed of all this wrote a second time to Nestorius,[4] treating with contempt the accusations retailed against him and with seriousness the dogmatic question. Nestorius answered in a wry tone, but at the same time enforced his arguments.

As to the proceedings with which he was threatened, Cyril was inwardly more concerned than he was willing to avow. He explains himself on the subject with greater freedom in a letter to his secretaries. He has no fear, he says, of exposing himself to inconvenience: he knows by experience that Councils sometimes have different results from those expected by the people who summon them.[5] Then, coming to Nestorius, he adds: "Let not this poor creature imagine that I shall allow myself to be tried by him, whatever may be the type of accusers that he will hire against me. The *rôles* will be reversed: I shall refuse to recognize his jurisdiction, and I shall know well enough how to compel him to make his own defence."[6]

Despite this brave assurance he did not neglect to provide himself with means of support. He knew what an unfavourable impression had been made at Rome both by the writings of

[1] Cyril, *Ep.* 3.

[2] I think that Philip of Side is meant: the reason adduced to the contrary by Tillemont (*Hist. Eccl.* vol. xiv., p. 321) is worthless.

[3] For the first of the two misdoings, for Celestius did not present himself to support his accusation. Cyril, *Epp.* 5 and 11 (Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, tom. lxxvii., pp. 56 and 88).

[4] *Ep.* 4, the *Epistola dogmatica*, Καταφλυαροῦσι μέν: we see from the Council of Chalcedon, Session 2, that it belonged to the month of Mechir (January 26 to February 24), 430.

[5] An allusion to the business of St John Chrysostom.

[6] *Ep.* 10.

Nestorius and his attitude in regard to the Pelagian leaders. Hence he did not hesitate to write to Pope Celestine a letter of great humility and great adroitness[1] in which he designates him "Most holy Father,"[2] and recalls the tradition according to which serious questions ought always to be submitted to the Holy See.[3] Starting from this consideration he depicts in the darkest colours the position of the Church of Constantinople, in which, except for a few flatterers, everyone —monks, the faithful, senators—refuses communion with the Bishop. Has not an accomplice of Nestorius, a bishop called Dorotheus, dared to declare in the open church, "Anathema to anyone who says that Mary is Mother of God," and that in the presence of Nestorius and without disavowal on his part? It means the condemnation of all the bishops of the East,[4] and specially of those of Macedonia.[5] Cyril has done all that he can: he has written against the errors of Nestorius: he has written to him personally—without result. What is to be done? Let Celestine give his advice and strengthen the resistance of the Eastern Episcopate. To assist him in making up his mind, Cyril communicates to him a whole *dossier* of documents[6] calculated to inform him on the subject of the unsound doctrines of the Bishop of Constantinople.

Celestine's reply, which had been under discussion in a Council[7] held in Rome at the beginning of August (430), was such as Cyril certainly could not have dared to hope. The Roman Church declared the teaching of Nestorius impossible of acceptance, and the excommunications pronounced by him to be void: he himself must either retract formally and in writing or descend from his episcopal throne. A delay of only ten days, to count from the day when he should receive the Pope's letter, was given him to make up his mind. In

[1] *Ep.* 11.

[2] Cyril had been a Bishop ten years longer than Celestine.

[3] This tradition had been quite forgotten at Alexandria at the time of Chrysostom's affair.

[4] Of the Eastern Empire.

[5] Holding jurisdiction from the Pope—a fact which in Cyril's form of argument gave them a certain prominence.

[6] Especially his five books, "Against the blasphemies of Nestorius," his two letters to Nestorius and some homilies of the latter.

[7] Fragments in Arnobius the younger, *Conflictus*, ii. 13 (Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, tom. liii., p. 289).

place of his heresies he must profess, on the subject of Christ, the doctrine of the Churches of Rome and Alexandria—that of the Universal Church. For the purpose of carrying this sentence into effect Cyril was commissioned as representative of the Roman Pope.[1]

A more decisive sentence it would be impossible to imagine, but two things were cause for regret: in the first place that the task of despatching the Archbishop of Constantinople should have been entrusted to his traditional rival, the Patriarch of Alexandria, who in this case deemed himself a personal enemy; and further, that the Pope had not laid down either what was exactly the doctrine that he rebuked in Nestorius[2] or in what consisted this teaching common to Rome, to Alexandria, and to the Universal Church to which the Patriarch of Constantinople was so severely recalled. Between what was taught at Alexandria, what was believed at Rome, and what was set forth at Antioch, there were notable differences. One might suspect the fact at that time and it was clearly seen later. It would have been worth while to state definitely both what was being condemned and what was being demanded. Cyril, left to himself and entrusted with drawing up the programme, found himself strongly tempted to introduce into it his own conceptions: he did not fail to do so.

Being mindful of everything, he had thought also of the

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 372, August 11, 430. Similar letters to Nestorius (*ibid.* 374), to the clergy of Constantinople (*ibid.* 375), to John of Antioch, to Juvenal of Jerusalem, to Rufus of Thessalonica, and to Flavian of Philippi (*ibid.* 373).

[2] At Rome it seems most likely that they saw in Nestorius a resurrection of Paul of Samosata with certain mitigations, somewhat like the Adoptionist theory of Leporius. It was thus that he was represented by the fanatics of Constantinople. Cassian adopts almost the same point of view in regard to it, and his report, drawn up for the Holy See and at its request, must have had great weight in Roman estimates. Nestorius (Mansi, *Concilia*, tom. v., p. 763) complains that Cyril by adroit cuts in the text of his homilies, has endeavoured to produce this impression at Rome. He speaks also of the simplicity of Celestine—*simpliciorem quam qui posset vim dogmatum subtilius penetrare.* Celestine, as a matter of fact, so far as can be judged from the affair of Antony of Fussala and from his letter to the bishops of Provence, seems to have had some gaps. By a singular irony, this "simplicity" which Nestorius points to in him, he had himself pointed out in Sisinnius, the predecessor of Nestorius (Jaffé, *op. cit.* 372).

Court, which up to this point had upheld the bishop of its choice. Cyril set himself, not openly but by an indirect attack, to detach it from Nestorius. To this end he drew up three letters of extreme prolixity, and addressed them, one to the Emperors—as a matter of fact to Theodosius II., another to the virgins Arcadia and Marina, the third to the Empresses (Pulcheria and Eudocia). They made a bad impression. The Court, evidently yielding to the advice of Nestorius, was now toying with the plan of an Œcumenical Council. Cyril was informed of this by an imperial letter (*sacra*) of great severity,[1] in which he was reproached with causing trouble in the Church, and by writing separately to the Emperor and to Pulcheria with assuming or provoking discords even in the reigning family. The questions of doctrine which serve as a pretext for these commotions will be discussed at the Council, and it will be absolutely necessary that he should present himself at it, on pain of incurring the displeasure of the Emperor. Nestorius also speaks of the Council in a letter[2] that he wrote to Rome before Celestine had taken his decision. The assembly, he says, will, among other things, have to give a ruling on the complaints laid against Cyril, complaints which Cyril was endeavouring to smother by his babbling on the subject of the *Theotokos*. At bottom the Bishop of Constantinople had no absolute objection to the use of this term, provided that there was not attached to it an Apollinarian or an Arian sense: he preferred, however, the expression, "Mother of Christ," which seemed to him more exact than those of "Mother of God" and "Mother of man," sometimes in conflict. The Council besides would have an opportunity of deciding this question too.

Thus two solutions were in process of cutting across each other: the citation of Nestorius in the name of Pope Celestine, and the examination alike of his affair and of some others in an Œcumenical Council. Cyril, whom only the first suited, held resolutely to it and hastened to bring it about. For this purpose at the beginning of November 430 he collected his suffragans in council and caused them to adopt a letter,[3] by

[1] Mansi, *Concilia*, tom. iv., p. 1109.

[2] Coustant, *Epp. Rom. Pont.*, p. 1147; *cf.* Evagrius, *H. E.* i. 7.

[3] Cyril, *Ep.* 17: similar letters to the clergy and to the monks of Constantinople.

which he formally cited the Bishop of Constantinople and notified to him his deprivation in case he should not within the ten days have submitted himself. And what he meant by submission was the acceptance of a long dogmatic formulary drawn up by him, Cyril, and summed up in twelve anathemas. Here the Bishop of Alexandria availed himself with small moderation of the latitude left him by the Roman instructions. What he proposed to Nestorius was not the common faith of the Churches of Rome and Alexandria as also of the Universal Church: it was a particular theology, received at Alexandria since it was that of the Bishop, but unknown at Rome and very unfavourably regarded in Syria. But Cyril was not a man to make a temperate use of victory.

On December 6, 430, the Alexandrian citation was handed to Nestorius. It must have crossed *en route* the imperial letter of summons to the Œcumenical Council. This letter was dated November 19, 430. The Council was to be held at Ephesus, at Whitsuntide of the following year.

Up to this point, the quarrel, apart from the noise to which it had given rise at Constantinople, had remained circumscribed between Nestorius and Cyril. The "Eastern," *i.e.* Syrian bishops, had not yet taken part in it. Since the recent death of Theodotus (429), the see of Antioch had been occupied by an old friend of Nestorius—John, a man of some theological learning and of amiable manners. But the most distinguished of the Syrian prelates was Acacius of Berœa, who had continued in the performance of his office from the time of Meletius and of Pope Damasus. He had been a bishop for more than fifty years and was at least 100 years old. In the time of Chrysostom, Theophilus of Alexandria had reckoned him as one of his best allies. Cyril thought that it would be useful to conciliate him, and after the indiscreet outburst by Dorotheus[1] wrote him a letter of a very pressing kind. The old bishop, though he had half entered the other world, distinguished very clearly the true feelings of his correspondent. He knew the nephew of Theophilus too well for it to be easy to "get any change" out of him. In reading his reply Cyril must have had the sensation of a cold douche thrown upon his enthusiasm.[2]

[1] *Supra*, p. 234. [2] *Epp.* 14, 15.

Meantime he despatched to their address the letters that Celestine had sent him for Juvenal of Jerusalem and John of Antioch.[1] The first was a prelate of considerable fondness for intrigue, whose claims for pre-eminence threw him into the *clientèle* of the Bishop of Alexandria. As for John he at once adopted the position of the man of good sense. He wrote to Nestorius both in his own name and in that of some other Syrian bishops[2] a letter of very affectionate tone in which he tried to persuade him to do what the Pope asked of him and to give up his opposition to the *Theotokos*.[3] Nestorius answered him in the same tone, adopting his views, accepting the *Theotokos* without any holding back, while reserving to the Council the task of deciding what was exactly involved in this controverted expression. He even sent him a sermon in which he had approved of *Theotokos*, provided that it was not taken in the Arian or Apollinarian sense.[4] According to him the best way of removing this wrong sense was to join to the title of "Mother of God" that of "Mother of man."[5]

Thus, thanks to the good sense of the Easterns and to the concessions made by Nestorius, the dispute was in a fair way towards a peaceful settlement. Cyril's propositions of anathema came to disturb these favourable relations. John no sooner had them before his eyes than he discovered in them the influence of Apollinarianism. Without delay he communicated his opinion to Firmus, his colleague of Cæsarea in Cappadocia.[6]

[1] *Epp.* 13, 16. [2] Theodoret figures among them.

[3] Mansi, *Concilia*, tom. iv., p. 1061: "Do not treat this business lightly, for it is by pride that the devil renders these dissensions incurable. Read them [the Pope's letters] with care, taking counsel at the same time with some persons to whom you will give complete liberty to state frankly their opinion without thought of flattering you." John is much concerned for the maintenance of ecclesiastical unity: "The West and Egypt, and no doubt Macedonia also, have made up their minds to break the union which has cost so much sweat and pain to such holy and illustrious bishops, in particular to our holy and common father the great Acacius [of Berœa]." He wrote also to some intimate friends of Nestorius—the Count Irenæus and the two bishops Musæus and Helladius (Mansi, *Conc.* tom. v., p. 753).

[4] Mansi, *Conc.* v., pp. 753, 754.

[5] See his two sermons subsequent to the receipt of the Anathemas of Cyril (Loofs, *Nestoriana*, pp. 297, 313): the second is identical with that which was communicated to John of Antioch.

[6] Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 756.

The Bishops of Cyrrhus and Samosata, Theodoret and Andrew, devoted to them, at his request, formal refutations.[1] As for Nestorius, he no doubt considered that the calling of the Council and the extravagant form given by Cyril to the Pope's summons dispensed him from the necessity of making any reply to it. He confined himself to setting forth in opposition to the Alexandrian anathemas a series of counter-anathemas in which, as Cyril had done, he censured the errors which he discovered in his opponent. The anathemas of Nestorius are orthodox in this sense—that there is ground for condemning the doctrines which he condemns. The problem is to determine whether the two adversaries have observed the limits of fairness in pressing one another to the extreme consequences of their statements.[2]

These skirmishes occupied the winter and the spring, and the time was thus reached which had been appointed for the Council. Many hopes were being built upon its meeting. The first to ask for it had been the monks of Constantinople who had been ill-treated by Nestorius on account of their protests[3]: they formed the centre of the local opposition. However, it was not to show favour to people of this kind, taken as a whole insignificant enough, that the Government had resorted to so grave a step. If the Bishop of Alexandria had not intervened in the vociferous way that we have seen, one may believe that they would have left Nestorius to settle the affairs of his church for himself. But the Bishop of Alexandria was raising the cry of Heresy and summoning the whole world to the defence of the Faith: his appeal was echoed at Rome. The position, in the eyes of the world at large, had a strong resemblance to that in the 4th century, when Athanasius in alliance with the West had been seen defending Orthodoxy against the Bishops of Constantinople and Antioch. In matters of doctrine, the successor of Athanasius enjoyed, not only in Egypt but throughout the whole of the Greek Orient, an authority which, if it was ill-defined, was of considerable weight. To assemble the Council was, in such circumstances,

[1] Known from Cyril's replies (Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, lxxvii., pp. 316, 385; *cf. Ep.* 44).

[2] The Greek text is lost: the best edition of the Latin version by Marius Mercator is that of Loofs, *Nestoriana*, p. 211.

[3] See their request to the Emperor, Mansi, *Conc.* iv., p. 1101.

to open a kind of appeal against his judgement. The situation became more definite still after the publication of the proposals for Anathema. It seemed that the parts had been interchanged, and that the Master of Theology who lectured others so readily was himself placed in an awkward corner. In fact the Council had been summoned against Cyril.

Cyril, who was well aware of this, took his measures accordingly. The imperial summons demanded for each province a small number of bishops. The number which Cyril put on board was fifty[1]; and to these he added a considerable number of inferior clergy, of *Parabolani* and other Church officials, and, above all, some monks. Among the last, the most prominent was the famous Schnoudi, almost a hundred years old, who had come down from his monastery on the upper Nile.[2] The whole throng was devoted body and soul to the Patriarch: the idea in the minds of all of them was that they were setting out, under his leadership, to slay the Dragon of Hell.

The Egyptian squadron had a favourable passage to the island of Rhodes and from thence came to land at Ephesus,[3] a few days before Pentecost. Nestorius was already there. He too had arrived with a considerable *suite*, if not of bishops, at any rate of supporters and dependents.[4] One of his most devoted friends, the Count Irenæus, had been granted leave to accompany him but only in a private capacity: the Emperor had another representative. On June 12 arrived Juvenal of Jerusalem with some fifteen bishops of Palestine. This was a reinforcement for Cyril, since Juvenal seems to have

[1] Egypt at that time comprised six provinces—Egypt proper, Augustamnica, Arcadia, Thebaïs, Libya Superior, and Libya Inferior; but there was no other episcopal metropolitan save the Bishop of Alexandria.

[2] So says his biographer; but he is here so inexact in regard to details that even with regard to the chief fact—the presence of Schnoudi at the Council of Ephesus—it would be permissible to entertain doubts if Schnoudi himself had not mentioned it in some of his sermons (Leipoldt, *Schenute*, pp. 42, 90; are these sermons really genuine?) In regard to Schnoudi, *see* Vol. II., p. 398.

[3] Letters of Cyril to the clergy of Alexandria, despatched from Rhodes and from Ephesus, *Epp.* 20, 21.

[4] There were also, among the attendants, a considerable number of people of the same social stratum as the sailors and *parabolani* of Alexandria. It was suggested that Nestorius had recruited them at the Baths of Zeuxippus, a place of very ill repute.

held the same opinions as he did.[1] This ambitious prelate was engaged at that time in trying to create a Patriarchate for himself at the expense of that of Antioch; it was a matter of grave moment to him not to offend the ecclesiastical potentate of Alexandria. But the source from which Cyril could best swell his majority was the actual country in which the Council was meeting. The "Diocese" of Asia was, with the exception of the African provinces, the country richest in bishoprics: there were nearly 300 of them. They were not grouped, like those of Egypt, under the traditional authority of a recognized head. However, the importance of the town of Ephesus, which was the headquarters of the highest administrative authorities, and the memory of the Apostle John whose mysterious tomb was sheltered by a highly venerated basilica, united to give it a position of great prominence. It seemed on the way to become in the ecclesiastical order a centre after the pattern of Alexandria and of Antioch. The Œcumenical Council of 381 had decided that each "Diocese" should concern itself with its own religious affairs. From this decree, which was directed at the time against the interference of Alexandria, the Bishops of Ephesus had for a long time deduced consequences favourable to their own authority. It seems likely that they would have secured acceptance for these if they had not clashed with a simultaneous pretension, that of the Bishops of Constantinople who were very anxious to attach to their own obedience the two "Dioceses" of Asia and Pontus. In these circumstances it was not difficult to turn against the Bishops of Constantinople the ambition of their colleagues of Ephesus. Already, in the days of Chrysostom, protests had been made in conjunction with them against the inter-

[1] One of his priests, Hesychius, wrote a History of the Council of Ephesus in four books. He was a friend of Eutyches, who found hospitality with him at the time of the Council of Chalcedon. This we learn from the work (still unedited) of the Roman deacon, Pelagius, against the condemnation of the Three Chapters, Book II.: "Esychii presbiteri Hierosolymitani historia, quam in quatuor libellis de eis quae apud Ephesum sunt acta composuit . . . Constat eumdem Esychium Eutychis haeretici fuisse consortem, in tantum ut fugientem sanctae synodi Chalcedonensis examen apud se eumdem Eutychen in Hierosolymis libenter exceperit et libros contra sanctam synodum Chalcedonensem et contra epistolam beatae memoriae Leonis ad Flavianum Constantinopolitanum antistitem datam scripserit."

ferences of the bishop of the capital. The reception given to Proclus by the people of Cyzicus, in the time of Sisinnius, shows that the "Asiatics" had not lost their particularist views, and the intervention of Nestorius in the business of the Macedonians and of the Quartodecimans must have helped to arouse them. In short, Cyril found in the Bishop of Ephesus, Memnon, an auxiliary entirely devoted to him, and Memnon set himself to recruit supporters for him in the provinces in which his own influence made itself felt. A hundred "Asiatic" bishops at least came in this way to place themselves under the orders of the Pope of Alexandria.

He had his majority. To keep it alive while waiting for the opening of the sessions of the Council, he engaged continually in the delivery of addresses and the discussion, in writing or orally, of the views of Nestorius. With the latter he had no communication: they made no effort to see one another. They might have been called the heads of two hostile camps. Discreditable stories were in circulation. It was the position of 403 over again—a renewal of the conflict of Theophilus and John. Each of the two Patriarchs pretended to consider the other as an accused person, suspected of heresy and destined to a speedy condemnation. These feelings of the leaders were translated in the inferior ranks of their supporters into brawls between Nestorius' people and the sailors of Alexandria. Memnon the Bishop had openly taken sides with Cyril, and contrary to all law and all decency he kept his churches, even the Basilica of St John, closed to Nestorius and his followers.

To represent him at the Council and to ensure the regularity of its proceedings, the Emperor had sent one of the high officials of his Court, the Count Candidian, Commander of the Guard (*Comes domesticorum*). His instructions forbade him to be present at debates on doctrine, but he was to take care that they had been properly arranged at the outset, all the members of the Council being present and each having liberty to produce his reasons. He was further charged with keeping order outside.

However, the time fixed (June 7) had passed by some days. The Bishops of Macedonia, under the leadership of Flavian of Philippi, had arrived. They were still waiting for the delegates whom the Pope had promised to send and who were on the road. St Augustine had been expressly summoned, for the

news of his death was slow in reaching Constantinople. The Bishop of Carthage, Capreolus, in view of the position in Africa, was unable either to collect his council or to find bishops to go to Ephesus. He contented himself with sending a deacon named Bessula, who arrived before the Roman legates. The Syrians, too, had still to be waited for. They were coming by land; and their caravan, as always happens, had met with various accidents. It was composed of some thirty prelates under the leadership of the Patriarch, John. The old Bishop of Berœa had remained at home. It seemed natural to wait both for the Roman legates and for the Easterns: the latter were not now far away; they sent excuses for their delay and asked for a further postponement for a few days.

But Cyril was apprehensive that the presence of the Easterns would bring to Nestorius a powerful reinforcement, if not of numbers, at any rate of authority. Further, it was clear that when debate was joined upon the Faith, his proposals for Anathema would be challenged by people who had been engaged for some months in combating them as heretical. This mode of procedure laid him open to unpleasant reprisals. Hence he made up his mind to an audacious *coup de force*, closely resembling that which had proved so successful for his uncle Theophilus in the business of John Chrysostom: to avoid being in the position of the accused, he boldly assumed the *rôle* of judge.

Of all the great prelates who found themselves at Ephesus, he was (with the exception of Nestorius) the one of highest rank from the place of his see. He considered himself also as representative of Pope Celestine—this in virtue of the commission which he had received for it in the previous year.[1] In this double capacity he put himself forward as the unquestionable president of the Council, and on June 21 summoned it to meet on the following day.

It was too much. On the same evening he received a

[1] Whether he had a real right to this position is a different matter. He had been charged to summon Nestorius and to depose him in the name of the Holy See if within ten days satisfaction had not been given. Another method of procedure having been adopted, and Cyril having accepted it, since he had come to the Council, his commission seems clearly to have expired. Besides, the best proof that the Pope had no idea of causing himself to be represented by him is the fact that he was sending legates.

protest signed by 68 bishops of whom 21 were metropolitans. Any one but Cyril would have hesitated; but his choice was made. On Monday, June 22, 431, about 160 bishops[1] gathered in the principal church of Ephesus, which bore the name of Mary,[2] around Cyril of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, and Memnon of Ephesus. Count Candidian hastened thither, protested, and implored the assembly and its presidents to wait for the arrival of the Easterns, declaring that this was what his instructions required. He was asked to show them. After a little hesitation, he complied and read them. Cyril took no notice of them. Some bishops on the side of Nestorius appeared and endeavoured to secure a hearing for the protest already sent on the previous evening. They were shown the door, together with Count Candidian himself, who complained of having been affronted and mishandled.

This done,[3] Nestorius was sent a second[4] summons, which

[1] Others signed subsequently and this raised the number to nearly 200.

[2] This name might in strictness be that of a Foundress. I consider, however, that it is much more probable that it is that of the mother of the Saviour, though such a dedication, at so early a date, has something surprising about it. We must notice further that the official form, that of the formal records of the Council, is not the Church of Mary but the Church Mary, the church called Mary. In these circumstances, one might conceive of a mystical conception, a sort of union of John and Mary, in which the memory of the mother of Christ and that of the Church of Ephesus were mutually intertwined. The Church of Ephesus, like Mary, had been entrusted to the Apostle John. John and Mary, the patron Apostle and Ephesian Christianity, the sanctuary of the Apostle and the Cathedral of Ephesus: the symmetry goes on from the historical personages to the religious conditions, and from these to the buildings which symbolize them. If there were apart from this name any tradition whatever of a sojourn of Mary at Ephesus or of her burial in that town, we might attach to it the explanation of this puzzle. Unhappily there is none, except for some alleged visions with which it is quite impossible for me to deal. Besides they are not connected with the town of Ephesus but with a place in the neighbourhood.

[3] From this point onward I follow the formal record of the first session, not without some misgiving, for it was only drawn up some days afterwards, by the "chancery" of Alexandria, which had no exaggerated scruples. We may judge of this by noticing that the reading of Candidian's instructions and the formal protest of the sixty-eight bishops are passed over completely in silence.

[4] The first had been made the evening before to Nestorius as to all the bishops present at Ephesus.

was refused, and then a third: the last was a real citation, as though addressed to an accused person. He did not accept it. The debates opened without him. Cyril caused the Creed of Nicæa to be read, then his second letter to Nestorius,[1] and asked for a vote which should proclaim the agreement of these documents and the orthodoxy of the second: he obtained it. They passed on to the reply of Nestorius, in regard to which an unfavourable vote was given.[2] Then was read, under the head of Documents and without any vote, the letter by which Pope Celestine commissioned Cyril to depose Nestorius and that by which Cyril had notified to the latter the clauses of the submission demanded of him, that is, the celebrated proposals for Anathema. Some statements were also produced which had been collected at Ephesus from Nestorius' own lips[3] and some extracts from his published homilies. In opposition to them were quoted a certain number of passages[4] extracted from the holy Fathers down to Theophilus and Atticus. From this investigation the assembly[5] arrived at the conclusion that Nestorius was a heretic and deserved to be deposed.

In the meantime Count Candidian was entering protest, by posting up formal notices, against the meeting in St Mary's and what was going on there. He made a further protest on the

[1] *Epistola dogmatica*, Καταφλυαροῦσι μέν.

[2] 135 votes with reasons for Cyril's letter and 34 against that of Nestorius appear in the formal record; but the votes thus given with reasons do not represent all the adhesions. The assembly was unanimous.

[3] Among others that one could not say of a child of two or three months that He is God (Mansi, *Conc.* iv., p. 1181; *cf.* Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 34). This was reported to the Council by Theodotus, the Bishop of Ancyra. Nestorius explained later that he had been wrongly understood and that he had confined himself to saying that God could not have had the age of two or three months. See the texts cited by Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his Teaching*, 1908, chap. v. It is the constant confusion between Nature and Person.

[4] Two, borrowed from alleged writings of Popes Julius and Felix, are in reality extracts from Apollinarian works; but that matters little. The others, quite authentic, are significant in another sense.

[5] In reality all these extracts are orthodox, provided that one judges them not according to the theology of Cyril, but according to that of St Leo and of the Council of Chalcedon. If there are here and there expressions which would be criticized at present, these modes of speech explain themselves by usages of language adopted at Antioch, before discussion and the definitions of Councils had given precision to the use of terms.

following day.[1] He protested much, but he did not dare to act. We can well see why. Apart from this worthy official's hesitation to lay hands on the bishops, he felt them to be defended by popular enthusiasm. When the sitting which had continued all through a long June day was at last at an end, when the news was spread abroad of the condemnation of Nestorius, the enormous crowd which was besieging the Basilica broke into shouts of joy. The bishops were greeted with acclamation and escorted to their lodgings with lighted torches: the whole town was illuminated.[2] For these good people Christ had vanquished heresy, Mary had triumphed over Nestorius.

It is under this simple aspect that the Council of Ephesus was speedily grasped by men's imaginations, especially in the West: it is this impression of it which remained. The reality is more complex.

On the following day, if not the same evening, Cyril communicated to Nestorius his sentence of deposition, drawn up in language of scant amenity. "To Nestorius, new Judas. Know that by reason of thine impious preachings and of thy disobedience to the canons, on the 22nd of this month of June, in conformity with the rules of the Church, thou hast been deposed by the Holy Synod, and that thou hast now no longer any rank in the Church."

Whilst the chief persons concerned, Nestorius, Cyril, Candidian, were writing to Constantinople and to Alexandria,[3] Cyril and his friends were preaching vigorously in the churches of Ephesus.[4] The caravan of the Easterns arrived on the 26th,[5] four days after the Synod.[6]

[1] Mansi, *Conc.* v., pp. 770-772. [2] Cyril, *Ep.* 24.

[3] Nestorius to the Emperor (Mansi, *Conc.* iv., p. 1232; Loofs, *Nestoriana*, p. 186); Cyril (or his Synod) to the Church of Constantinople (Mansi, iv., p. 1228), to the Emperor (*ibid.* p. 1236), to the clergy and to the people of Constantinople (*ibid.* p. 1241), to the clergy and to the people of Alexandria (*ibid.*). The report of Candidian has not been preserved: it is mentioned in the imperial reply to the Synod (*ibid.* p. 1377; *cf.* tom. v., p. 773).

[4] Mansi, *Conc.* iv., pp. 1245, 1248, 1252.

[5] This date is settled for the future, from the text of the *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, tom. i.[2], p. 24.

[6] Cyril attempted at this time and later to explain this delay in a manner which has little likelihood. According to him they had waited sixteen days after the date fixed for the opening of the Council. With these sixteen days

The new-comers, who had already learnt *en route* what had just taken place, had hardly descended from their mounts when they were met by Cyril's envoys who notified them, with some arrogance, as matters concluded and in the ordinary course, of the deposition of Nestorius and the prohibition to hold communion with him. They held council forthwith at the lodging of the Patriarch John. Some of the bishops who had not been present at the meeting on the 22nd joined them, and they thus increased in number to forty-three.[1] Count Candidian presented himself and gave them officially an account of what had happened in despite of the Emperor's orders and of his own protests. With minds full of Cyril's proposals for Anathema, the Easterns judged that his bold stroke had no other object than that of saving himself from being put on trial for his doctrine: in this they were not much mistaken. Then, without waiting any longer, without citation, without discussion, they pronounced the deposition of the Patriarch of Alexandria and of the Bishop of Ephesus, as well as the excommunication of all their adherents until they should come to a better mind—in other words, until they condemned the proposals for Anathema.

We cannot imagine such utter lack of balance. Cyril was outdone. The unassailed and impressive position which John and his party might have taken was compromised by an act of headstrong folly. In the town of Ephesus disorder was carried to its height. Cyril and Memnon paid no regard to John's interdicts, and continued to officiate at services. The Bishop of Ephesus closed his churches to the Easterns. The latter made a definite display of putting their sentences into operation. The Bishop of Antioch attempted one day to enter the Basilica of St John for the purpose of consecrating a new bishop in place

we should arrive at the 23rd; but it was from the 21st that the convocation took place. He pretended further that two bishops, Alexander of Apamea and Alexander of Hierapolis, who had been sent on ahead and had arrived *after* the sixteen days, had said, on John's behalf, that if he still delayed, they could begin without waiting for him. That this statement has been falsely reported or understood follows (1) from a letter of John to Cyril, written at five or six days' distance from Ephesus (Mansi, *Conc.* iv., p. 1121); (2) from the formal protest of the sixty-eight bishops in which appear the signatures of the two prelates in question; (3) from the later attitude of the Easterns.

[1] This is the figure given in Cyril's Acts: in the *Synodicon* we find fifty-four signatures; some seem to have been added after the event.

of Memnon. Memnon's people opposed it, and the Patriarch was repulsed.

Bewildered by these ecclesiastical storms Count Candidian sent to Constantinople report after report. On June 29, an imperial rescript was despatched to Ephesus, expressing explicit disapprobation of what had been done prematurely, and by a section only of the bishops, that is by Cyril's Council, the Council of June 22, forbidding the prelates to leave Ephesus, and announcing the sending of another imperial commissioner. Meanwhile the Roman legates were at last landing at Ephesus. They were three in number, two bishops, Arcadius and Projectus, whose sees are not noted in the documents, and Philip, priest of "the Church of the Apostles" at Rome.[1] Their instructions[2] enjoined them to refer themselves absolutely to Cyril: they put themselves at his disposal. Cyril's assembly met in their presence (July 10, 11) and took cognizance of the letters which they brought for the Council. They asked that since proceedings had taken place in their absence,[3] the formal record of the matter should be submitted to them. After hearing it read they approved of what had been done, and subscribed the deposition of Nestorius.

Cyril, feeling himself reinforced by this new approbation from Rome, made up his mind to take proceedings against the Bishop of Antioch. Up to this point three depositions had been pronounced, those of Nestorius, of Cyril himself, and of Memnon. Nestorius had confined himself to a protest against the sentence which touched him: he had not acted in contravention of it by celebrating the Holy Mysteries; besides, as to that, Memnon would have taken effective measures. As for Cyril and Memnon they had given evidence of the importance which they attached to John's sentence by not observing it. In this they played a very risky game: it was on this same failure of observance that Theophilus had based himself in order finally to destroy Chrysostom. It was thus a matter

[1] *Supra*, p. 170. [2] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 378.

[3] They do not seem to have been affronted by it: at any rate the Acts of Cyril have not preserved any trace of protest. Besides, the case had been provided for in their instructions. In a letter addressed to Cyril, (Jaffé, 377) Celestine, in answer to a question of the Bishop of Alexandria on this head, said that Nestorius, if he retracted, ought to be admitted by the Council, even though the delay of ten days should long have expired.

of moment to them that John's authority and the competence of the Eastern Council should be solemnly set aside. It was to this that the 4th and 5th sessions of the Synod were devoted. They were held under the presidency of Cyril and the legates. John was cited, but without result.[1] They did not depose him: I am inclined to think that the Roman legates were not strangers to this moderation. It was only decreed that the Bishop of Antioch and his adherents should be excommunicated in this sense "that they should not be able, in virtue of their sacerdotal authority, to do anything which could harm or aid any one whatsoever."[2] By which we understand that they had not been able to depose Cyril and Memnon (this is explicitly stated) and that they would not be able to restore Nestorius. The sentence is to continue in force so long as they shall not have come to a better mind; if they delay too long, recourse will be had to severer measures.

All this was brought to the knowledge of the Emperor and of Pope Celestine. The letter addressed to the latter mentions the relations of certain Pelagians with the party of Antioch: it even says that the Council has had read to it the Acts of the deposition of the Pelagian leaders, Celestius, Pelagius, Julian, and others, and that it has expressly approved them. Nothing resembling this is to be read in the formal records of Ephesus. Of these matters no mention is made except to the Pope, with the evident intention of making a favourable impression. There is no mention of the proposals for Anathema, not even in relation to the sentence of the dissentient Council, of which they were the principal factor. John's delay is stated and explained in a way which is at least inaccurate.[3] Of the protest

[1] We find in this connexion Juvenal putting himself very much to the front and pretending that, according to tradition, the throne of Antioch ought to be judged and corrected by the Apostolic See of Jerusalem (Mansi, *Conc.* iv., p. 1312). He hesitated at nothing.

[2] Mansi, *Conc.* iv., p. 1324.

[3] It is said that for the deposition of Cyril and Memnon John had with him only thirty bishops, of whom several were bishops without see, others had been long interdicted by their metropolitans; others are Pelagians and Celestians; others people driven out of Thessaly. But the deposition of Cyril and Memnon bears the signatures of over 40 bishops (43 in the text of the Acts, 54 in the *Synodicon*), all of them furnished with a see; the unattached had all come with their metropolitans; there is no Pelagian bishop; from Thessaly there is, in the list of the Acts, only the metropolitan, Basil of Larissa, whose position was canonically correct. In the list of the

of the 68 bishops against the precipitated opening of the Council, not the least word is spoken. Celestine was admirably furnished with information.

Two further sessions were held, one (6th, July 22) on the subject of a Creed of a "Nestorian" character[1] which was being used in the diocese of Philadelphia[2]: it was on this occasion that it was decided that in the matter of Creed people must confine themselves thenceforward to that of Nicæa. In the seventh and last session[3] an effort was made by the bishops of Cyprus to withdraw themselves from the authority of the Patriarch of Antioch. The moment was well chosen for such a proceeding: the Council yielded to the desires of the Cypriots and recognized their autonomy.[4] The Patriarchate of Antioch was open to the spoiler. Juvenal of Jerusalem, who had long

Synodicon we find in addition Pausianus of Hypata, Maximus of Demetrias, and Theoctistus of Cæsarea in Thessaly. The ordination of Maximus, which had been celebrated apart from the Bishop of Thessalonica, had been annulled by Pope Boniface, who had in addition separated from communion with himself the three consecrators, of whom Pausianus was one (Jaffé, 363, sub anno 422); of Theoctistus we know nothing. Affairs of this kind ended customarily in an accommodation. Basil the metropolitan was certainly, about 424, in communion with Pope Celestine (Jaffé, 366), and the fact that his suffragans sit and sign with him implies that their position was regular. That one or other of them may have been driven from Thessaly is possible; but we should need to know by whom and why. It can be seen how disputable are Cyril's assertions (*cf.* p. 246, note 6 for inexactitudes in dates). According to him there were on the side of John of Antioch only some thirty persons of doubtful reputation.

[1] It is the creed of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

[2] The Bishop of Philadelphia, Theophanes, appears among the supporters of Nestorius. In the course of the campaign directed by the latter against the Novatians and the Quartodecimans, a priest named James arrived in Lydia from Constantinople with recommendations from two priests of Nestorius—Anastasius and Photius (*supra*, pp. 228, 232): he used to make the heretics whom he brought over to the Church sign the creed in question. This business was brought before Cyril's Council by the Steward of the Church of Philadelphia, a certain Charisius.

[3] The Latin text, the only one preserved, bears the date *Prid. Kal. Sept.* (August 31), which is certainly false. The true date must be in the month of July.

[4] The island of Cyprus certainly belonged to the "Diocese" of the Orient. The question which had been submitted about 415 to Pope Innocent by Alexander, the Bishop of Antioch, had been settled in favour of Antioch (Jaffé, 410). On this business see my article *Saint Barnabé* in the *Mélanges J. B. de Rossi*, p. 45.

been making a considerable show of independence in regard to the metropolitan of Cæsarea, and who permitted himself to consecrate bishops as far as Phœnicia Secunda (Damascus), and Arabia (Bostra), endeavoured to secure payment for his zeal by the express ratification of his pretensions.[1]

So passed the month of July. The Court was leisurely in its intervention. Its new delegate, the Count John, *Comes sacrarum largitionum*, the Minister of Finance as we should say, was delayed on the road and only arrived in the early days of August. By the official letter of which he was the bearer,[2] the sovereigns declared that they accepted the sentences of deposition passed against Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon; they endeavoured to bind the bishops to make peace and dismissed them to their respective churches again. John went to look for them and invited them to come to see him on the following day. It was a hard enough task to persuade them to do so, for being mutually excommunicated they refused every opportunity of meeting. However, the gathering took place. Memnon, it is true, refused to leave his episcopal residence, but Nestorius, Cyril, and John of Antioch obeyed the summons. However, when it came to reading the imperial letter, the Cyrillians protested that Nestorius and the Easterns must first be excluded as they had been condemned by their Council. Count John, on the ground that the letter was addressed neither to Nestorius nor to Cyril, made them both retire and compelled the rest to hear it read. The Easterns complied: since their arrival they had refrained from openly taking sides in favour of Nestorius; their official letters never mention him. As for the others they protested anew. That very evening Count John declared the three deposed bishops to be under arrest and set guards over them. He devoted himself next to reconciling the Easterns and the party of Cyril, but without result. In such circumstances it was

[1] We do not know exactly how far he succeeded. His game was perceived by the Easterns (*Synodicon*, c. 32; Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 804). Cyril himself, when he had no longer need of Juvenal, set himself in opposition to his pretensions (Letter of St Leo to Maximus of Antioch, Jaffé, 495).

[2] Mansi, *Conc.* iv., p. 1396. It is addressed to the bishops of the two parties without distinction and even without taking account of absences: the first named are Celestine of Rome and Rufus of Thessalonica, who were absent, and Augustine who was dead.

impossible for him to pronounce the dissolution of the Council. He referred the matter to the Emperor.

The Emperor alone, as a matter of fact, was in a position to put an end to this lamentable struggle. From both sides efforts were made to bias his decisions. The friends of Cyril employed the greatest activity. Two influences might be brought into play: first, that of his ordinary counsellors, eunuchs, chamberlains, and other persons in close proximity to the sovereign; then the influence of religion, which, as the clergy of Constantinople found themselves divided, could only be monastic influence, interpreted when necessary, but with considerable caution, by Pulcheria and the other princesses. I have said "with considerable caution," because Theodosius II. regarded his sisters with distrust and was unwilling to appear to be swayed by them. Upon the members of the Court Cyril had means of influence which would be repellent to our notions of fitness: he knew that in the East one does nothing without baksheesh and had no scruple in employing the treasures of Egypt in the service of the "good" cause. His physician, a certain John,[1] who arrived at Constantinople at a moment when Count Irenæus, who had been sent thither by the Easterns, thought himself certain of success, wrought miracles of persuasion. In an instant all the great personages of the Court were turned round.

More honourable, at any rate, was the other method of procedure. There was at Constantinople, in the monastery of Isaac, a recluse named Dalmatius,[2] who was regarded with great reverence. From his place of retirement, this holy man exercised a moral sway over the whole body of monks in the capital. He had little affection for Nestorius and took a keen interest in Cyril's efforts to dethrone him from his see. When he learnt, after considerable delay, for communications had been carefully watched, that things were going badly at Ephesus, he made up his mind to leave his cell, outside which he had not set foot for six-and-forty years. At the news of this departure all the monasteries emptied themselves: an enormous procession of monks made their way, to the chanting of psalms, through the crowds of the populace towards the

[1] Mansi, *Conc.* iv., p. 1393; v., p. 819 (*Synodicon*, 41).
[2] *Supra*, p. 215.

imperial palace. Among them was to be seen Eutyches, another monk of high renown who was known to be a firm friend of Cyril. Theodosius II. received the holy men and spoke them fair.

The efforts, however, still fell short of success. The Emperor tried a last method of conciliation. He ordered each of the two councils to send him eight deputies to engage in discussion in his presence, and to enable him to form an opinion for himself. The question of the *Theotokos*, which had been the starting-point of the business, was thenceforward settled. The Easterns made no difficulty in accepting this term: they said so definitely to Count John.[1] Nestorius himself had said and had repeated that, once properly explained, it might be used. He had also let it be understood that, if orthodoxy were secured, he was ready to abandon his see and to return to his monastery.[2] He was taken at his word, it would seem, and at rather better than his word, for without waiting for orthodoxy to receive the satisfaction which he hoped, he was taken back to Antioch (September 431).[3]

The satisfaction which he hoped and which the bishops of the East were urgently demanding was the condemnation of the proposals for Anathema. The heretical character of this document was in their view as clear as daylight. They exerted themselves to prove it to all comers and especially to the Emperor. The latter had summoned to Chalcedon the deputies of the two parties. On the side of Cyril there were Philip and Arcadius, two of the Roman legates,[4] Juvenal, Flavian, Firmus of Cæsarea, Theodotus of Ancyra, Euoptius of Ptolemaïs in Libya, brother and successor of the famous Synesius, and finally Acacius of Melitene, the best theologian of the whole party but also the least disposed to agreement. The Easterns were represented by the Patriarch John, escorted by Himerius of Nicomedia and six Syrian prelates, among whom Theodoret of Cyrus or Cyrrhos in Euphratesiana was the most distinguished by his knowledge and his eloquence.

[1] *Synodicon*, 47 (Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 783).

[2] *Synodicon*, 15 (Mansi, *ibid.* pp. 777, 779).

[3] *Synodicon*, 24-26 (Mansi, *ibid.* pp. 792-4).

[4] It was adroit to display the Roman legates. It was certainly not on them that they were relying for the defence of Cyril's theology; but their mere presence served as a recommendation of the other delegates.

At Chalcedon, as at Ephesus, the Easterns had to reckon with the hostility of the local clergy. Eulalius the bishop, a determined enemy of Nestorius, assailed them without scruple. From quite close at hand the monks of Rufinianae, led by their abbot, Hypatius, also made demonstrations against them. In vain did John and his friends invoke the support of the Bishops of Milan, Aquileia, Ravenna, and Thessalonica: the letters which they wrote to them either remained unanswered or arrived too late. On September 11 the Emperor arrived. There were several sessions with the Emperor in regard to which we are very vaguely informed by the letters of the Easterns. Theodoret disputed against Acacius of Melitene: he and his friends were of opinion that they had the better of it. However, the party of Cyril lent themselves little to conversations: they refused in particular to allow any discussion of the proposals for Anathema.[1] For the Easterns it was the *corpus delicti*.

At last, convinced of his own powerlessness to close the dispute and impressed by the presence of the Roman legates in Cyril's camp and by the number of his adherents, Theodosius II. decided abruptly to re-cross the Bosphorus and invited the Cyrillian delegates to come to Constantinople for the installation of the successor of Nestorius.

The clergy of Constantinople had for the most part but half-hearted sympathy for the former bishop: they continued to be divided among themselves in regard to the unending rivalry as candidates between Philip and Proclus. For the third time these were put forward; but they were again disregarded, and Maximian, an old priest of charitable and unassuming disposition, was chosen. He was consecrated on October 25, in the presence of the three legates of the Pope.[2] He was well known at Rome where he had made a long stay.[3]

[1] In view of this debate a collection of patristic texts had been drawn up by them, doubtless by Theodoret. The Abbé Saltet (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, vi., pp. 513 ff.) has succeeded in reconstructing it, by the aid of the *Eranistes* of Theodoret and especially of the *dossier* added by Pope Gelasius to his treatise *De duabus naturis in Christo* (Thiel, *Epp. Rom. Pont.*, p. 544 ff.). The latter is only a mere summary of the original collection.

[2] Bishop Projectus, whose name did not appear among the delegates, had rejoined his colleagues at Constantinople.

[3] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 392; Coustant, *Epp. Rom. Pont.*, p. 1261.

The special position of Constantinople[1] having thus been set in order, it was now necessary to finish with the Council. Cyril and Memnon were still at Ephesus, still under arrest. The fact that the Cyrillian delegates had been invited to the consecration of Maximian did not imply that the Emperor had decided in favour of Cyril's Council against John's. Since it was impossible to re-unite in a ceremony of the Church the delegates of the two assemblies, Theodosius had chosen those who were, for the moment, the most favourably regarded in Constantinople, who represented the largest number of bishops and included in their ranks the legates of the Holy See. As for his own opinions in regard to the Council they were plainly expressed in the two decrees by which he pronounced the dissolution of the assembly. In the first, after recalling all his efforts to arrange the dispute and emphasizing their lack of result, he ordered the bishops to go home and to endeavour by a more pacific course of conduct to repair the damage which they had done. As for Cyril and Memnon, whom the Emperor continued to regard as deposed, they were excepted from this leave to depart.

But Cyril had dealt with his own position for himself. Without waiting for the imperial rescript, he had succeeded in escaping and was on his voyage towards Alexandria. As it would have been difficult to start another pursuit of him in his own Egypt, it was decided to accept the *fait accompli*. To put as good a face as possible on the discomfiture of the Government a second rescript was despatched, in almost the same terms as the former: of Cyril and Memnon it was said not that they were regarded as bishops once more or were deemed to be deposed but merely that Cyril might return to Alexandria and Memnon remain at Ephesus. The Emperor added that so long as he lived he would never condemn the Easterns, for they had not been convicted in his presence on any point.

John returned to Antioch and Cyril to Alexandria, where he resumed his episcopal functions without authorization of any kind. However, his return was less triumphal than his departure had promised. It was soon known in Egypt that

[1] Nestorius had been considered by Cyril's party as deposed: others might hold that he had tendered his resignation. In any case the Government had removed him; for many nothing more was needed: the see was vacant.

he had involved himself in difficulties, that many bishops condemned him, and that the Government took stern measures with him. Pharaoh under arrest! What an indignity! And among the bishops who had made the expedition to Ephesus, more than one added under his breath that he had richly deserved it. Isidore of Pelusium, the only man who could speak frankly in that sternly regulated country, had no scruple in telling him of these reports. "Favour," so he wrote to him,[1] "obscures the view, but hatred blinds completely. . . . A number of those who have been at Ephesus represent you as a man burning to avenge an injury of his own, not to seek in orthodoxy the glory of Jesus Christ. He is, they say, the nephew of Theophilus. He acts just like him. The fury of the uncle was unleashed against John, the Saint, the Friend of God; the other too, though the two cases are very different, has sought for a success on which he can make his boast."

He had sought it: he had obtained it. Nestorius had fallen from his episcopal throne, and that by the sentence of the Bishop of Alexandria. Once more Egypt had prevailed against Constantinople. When himself was made the subject of an enquiry he had evaded the discussion of his Anathemas and that was the main thing, for his deposition by the Easterns was of no account in his eyes.

However, the Anathemas continued to be a source of trouble. Ever since they appeared he had had to defend them, and not against Nestorius but against people of manifest orthodoxy such as Theodoret and Andrew of Samosata. These charged them bluntly with heresy and were making vigorous efforts to prove their charge if anyone would consent to listen to them. Cyril, it is true, had caused the Anathemas to be read before his Council, but only as a document in the proceedings against Nestorius and without securing any vote on the question of their orthodoxy.[2] The Easterns were using this reading as an argument to implicate the whole Council in what they called

[1] *Ep.* 310; cf. *Ep.* 370.

[2] It had been absolutely necessary to read Celestine's letter by which Cyril had been commissioned: otherwise he could not have justified either his position as the Pope's representative or his intervention in the direction of the discussion. But when once Celestine's letter had been read, he could not avoid the production also of the formal Act by which he had discharged his commission.

the heresy of its head. It was an exaggeration. However, Cyril himself felt that he had gone too far. He evaded a vote at Ephesus, a discussion at Chalcedon. In his synodal report to Pope Celestine there is no mention of the Anathemas. Officially Rome remained for a long time in ignorance of this document, to which it would no doubt itself have raised certain objections.[1]

On Christmas Day 431 Pope Celestine received at St Peter's the delegates of the clergy of Constantinople who had come to notify him of the accession of Maximian. He was satisfied with this choice, and in the replies which he made on the 15th of the ensuing March to the letters which had been brought him from the Eastern capital he expressed his happiness that there had been given as a successor to Sisinnius a man of like simplicity. As for Nestorius he held that it was wrong to have allowed him to settle at Antioch where he could continue to do harm. In regard to him and to John of Antioch he was still relying upon the information furnished him by Cyril.[2] However, so far as John was concerned he had not lost all hope of his return. It was, however, under other auspices that this matter was to be continued. Celestine died on July 27, 432.

The Council of Ephesus had been summoned to re-establish religious peace, which had been disturbed at Constantinople and throughout the whole Eastern Empire. It had hardly

[1] On the testimony even of Cyril's formal records two letters of his were read at the Council, the first quite at the beginning of the session, after the creed of Nicæa (*supra*, p. 245), the other, the letter of the Anathemas, after the letter of Celestine to Nestorius. In his report in which he follows the order of the reading, Cyril does not mention any after Celestine's letter. In another place, he uses the ambiguous expression τά γράμματα . . . Κυρίλλου. Lower down, for the letters of Nestorius and of Celestine he makes use of the singular ἐπιστολή. Possibly the plural γράμματα (litterae) was used deliberately in order to extend it, in case of need, to the letter which contained the Anathemas. I think it, however, more probable, in view of the mention of the vote which follows that of the γράμματα, that Cyril, or the Council in whose name he writes, wished to throw into the shade the document which was the subject of dispute.

[2] The unlimited confidence accorded by Celestine to Cyril is only too closely reminiscent of the relations of his predecessor Zosimus with Patroclus, the Bishop of Arles. We no longer possess, unfortunately, the letters that he wrote to the Bishop of Alexandria after the Council.

succeeded in doing so. Nestorius, whose extravagance of language had been the cause of the evil, found himself, it is true, out of action and his successor appointed. In this respect the disorders in the capital were in course of settlement. There remained, however, at Constantinople a party of Nestorians in the same way as after the removal of Chrysostom there had remained a party of Johannites. Certain prelates who were friends of the ex-bishop, notably Dorotheus of Marcianopolis, kept this flame alight. Maximian, with the support of the Government, defended himself with some energy. The Pope's legates, Juvenal, Flavian, and other delegates of the Council were still at Constantinople.[1] A sentence of deposition which seems to have emanated from a meeting held by these prelates,[2] was launched not only against Dorotheus but also against three other metropolitans, Himerius of Nicomedia, Eutherius of Tyana, and Helladius of Tarsus. The last was a man of sanctity, a former monk who had been elected bishop late in life. Maximian had notified to him his own enthronement, but Helladius had refused his letters: he remained faithful to Nestorius, like all the Easterns, not considering him to have been lawfully deposed. It does not appear that any effort was made to secure the ousting of the Bishop of Tarsus. With the others the case was different. In regard to the Bishop of Nicomedia, which was near to the capital, they succeeded[3]: Dorotheus and Eutherius offered a more serious resistance, and for the time retained their sees.

A graver matter, and one in which the Council most completely failed in its aim, was that communion was broken with John of Antioch and his supporters. While returning to their homes the Easterns were subjected to insults on the way. The Bishops of Ancyra and Cæsarea treated them as excommunicate. On their side they halted from time to time, held council and engaged in reprisals. At Tarsus they pronounced once more the deposition of Cyril and of five of his

[1] Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 257.

[2] Maximian had not, according to ancient law, any authority over the three metropolitans of Asia Minor. Even if we allow for the pretensions of Constantinople, Helladius was certainly outside his jurisdiction and dependent on no one save the Patriarch of Antioch.

[3] Letter of Theodoret, in the *Synodicon*, c. 71 (Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 848).

deputies at Chalcedon.[1] On their return to their several dioceses they maintained their attitude. Nestorius, to whom they could not give back his bishopric, was treated by them as a colleague who had been irregularly dispossessed; Cyril as an abettor of disturbances and a heretic.

It was necessary for the Government to intervene. O happy days, so might have said some of the old consulars who had lingered in paganism, O happy days when pontiffs did not quarrel among themselves, when religious matters settled themselves administratively and without noise! Now it was necessary for the State to descend into this arena of raging theologians. It descended.

In matters of this kind governments are always inclined to simple solutions. It was proposed at first to make John and Cyril come to Nicomedia[2] and to effect their reconciliation: as if it would have been an easy matter, as if behind them there had not been brains that thought and hearts stirred to anger. Another scheme was propounded next: to make the Easterns accept the condemnation of Nestorius, and Cyril that of the Anathemas.[3] This meant adding together the wishes of the two parties; but, as each of them was attached to only half the programme and repudiated the other with the utmost energy, it was not very easy to achieve. Such, however, was the task entrusted to Aristolaus, tribune and notary, who was despatched as a peace-maker to Syria and Egypt about a year after the Council. This interval had been sufficient to cause the inconvenience of the schism to be felt. All relations were disturbed. Already Pope Celestine had expressed a desire to see a settlement arrived at with Antioch.[4] His successor, Xystus III., went further in this direction.[5] He wrote to Acacius of Berœa, an old acquaintance of the Romans,[6] and

[1] *Synodicon*, 66, 136, 141, 174 (Mansi, *Conc.* v., pp. 843, 917, 920, 953). We have not the names. The Roman legates had no doubt been spared.

[2] Imperial letter addressed to John (Mansi, *Conc.* v., pp. 277, 663, 664).

[3] Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte* ii., p. 252, is wrong in questioning that this was the requirement of the Court. Cf. *Synodicon*, 203 (Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 988): *Aristolaus insistebat ei* (*Cyrillo*) *ut divinitus sancita perageret.* The letter to John of Antioch (*Synodicon* 50; Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 827) which is relied upon is that of a person still badly informed.

[4] Jaffé, 385; Coustant, p. 1202. [5] Jaffé, 389, 390.

[6] *Synodicon*, 55 (Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 830).

made urgent efforts to enlist his interest in the welfare of the Church. The Emperor, on his side, addressed himself both to this venerable bishop and to the celebrated Stylite Simeon whose moral authority might have a considerable effect.[1]

Aristolaus went to Antioch and to Alexandria. At Antioch the subject of the withdrawal of the proposed Anathemas was at once mentioned to him. Acacius, who from the height of his 110 years seemed to tower above all parties was commissioned to write to Cyril to propose to him that adhesion should be given only to the Creed of Nicæa, explained when necessary by the letter of St Athanasius to Epictetus,[2] and that all other doctrinal expositions should be cast into oblivion.[3] This was to get rid at once of the writings of Cyril and of those of Nestorius. Cyril replied to the old Bishop of Berœa. In this letter and certain others which he wrote at this time he explained his proposed Anathemas, defended himself from all trucking with Arianism and Apollinarianism, but insisted still on requiring the condemnation of Nestorius.

At Constantinople Maximian lent him aid, but not so much as he would have wished. Like Cyril, the new Bishop of Constantinople insisted, and with reason, that the deposition of Nestorius should be recognized as valid. As for the Anathemas, for which he had not the paternal feelings of the Bishop of Alexandria, he did not see any reason why they should not be sacrificed.[4] At the Court a good many people talked in the same way. For a moment Cyril saw himself very closely hemmed in. He treated it as a very serious disorder, but did not allow himself to be in any way mastered by it. By his exertions all means of influence at Constantinople were set to work. The holy monks Eutyches and Dalmatius, the priests Philip and Claudian, Bishop Maximian himself, were desired to enlist the aid of Pulcheria, whom it was sought to influence also through her Maids of Honour, the *Cubiculariae* Marcella and Droseria, who were given presents for this purpose. Important eunuchs, favourite officials, received enormous *douceurs* in cash and in kind,

[1] *Synodicon*, 51, 52 (Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 828).
[2] See Vol. II., p. 471.
[3] *Synodicon*, 123, 129 (Mansi, v., pp. 829, 830).
[4] *Cf.* Liberatus, *Brev.* 8.

costly carpets, tapestries, furniture in ivory, live ostriches.[1] The Grand Chamberlain Chrysoretus was devoted to the Easterns. Hence, "in order that he may cease to attack us," they put themselves specially to expense. He obtained as many as six ostriches and all the rest in proportion. These self-interested gifts were described as "Benedictions": they were the *Eulogiae* of the Church of Alexandria.

The Church of Alexandria was not unanimous in its approval of the Bishop's acts of generosity: people considered his theology expensive, and they murmured against him. But Cyril knew what he was doing: the Anathema proposals, thanks to his astute measures, crossed in safety a very dangerous place.

He made vigorous personal efforts in addition and not without success. His letter to Acacius, with his explanations of the Anathemas, made a very good impression in the East. Acacius showed himself disposed to sympathize with his views. The same was the case with John of Antioch, and they seemed to have had with them the bishops of the provinces of Phœnicia (Tyre and Damascus), of Syria properly so called (Antioch and Apamea), and of Arabia (Bostra). In Cilicia, on the contrary, where in conjunction with the memory of Theodore of Mopsuestia, there ruled the present influence of Helladius of Tarsus, they would listen to nothing, and persisted in considering Cyril as a heretic: Eutherius of Tyana and Himerius of Nicomedia were at one in this. Such were also the views of the metropolitan of Euphratesiana, Alexander of Hierapolis. Theodoret and Andrew of Samosata, who belonged to this province, followed a middle course: while firmly maintaining their estimate of the Anathemas, they judged that Cyril had almost retracted them in explaining them. As for Nestorius it did not seem to them necessary that every one should condemn him: it was sufficient that some had done so.

Cyril's thought, we must recognize, was orthodox: this was clearly seen when he consented to explain it. The fault

[1] The list of these *douceurs* has been preserved in the *Synodicon*, as an appendix to Letter No. 203 (Mansi, v., p. 987). Earlier editors had been ashamed, apparently, to publish it. The Benedictines of Monte Cassino have given it in their *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, i², p. 46. It is, moreover, mentioned and summarized in the letter itself.

was that when translating it in his proposed Anathemas he had made use of terms that were suspect and of unfortunate origin, and in these the Easterns, prejudiced by their own theological usages and excited by the passion of the moment, saw things which were inadmissible. No one, it is true, asked them to adopt them as their own: all that it was desired to obtain from them was that, despite the Anathemas, they should consent to recognize that Cyril was not heretical. That they should accept his explanations as giving the true sense of the disputed document or as a retractation of this production, was after all a secondary matter. The Patriarch John left Theodoret to debate this question, and, disregarding the opposition of the most determined, he sent to Alexandria the Bishop of Emesa, Paul,[1] with letters of an extremely pacific tone. Cyril gave him a good reception: he was in a state of suffering, and this delayed the negotiations a little. It was agreed to let the question of the Anathemas drop as they had already been explained by their author, and he pledged himself to offer further explanations. In return Cyril accepted a profession of faith[2] which had been decided upon at Antioch: except for a phrase added to meet the occasion this form was taken, word for word, from a letter[3] addressed from Ephesus to the Emperor Theodosius II. by the Eastern Council, which there opposed the Anathemas uncompromisingly.

[1] Paul of Emesa was the trusted confidant of Acacius: he had represented him at Ephesus (Mansi, *Conc.* iv., p. 1400).

[2] "We profess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, perfect God and perfect man, endowed with a rational soul and a body, is born of the Father before the ages as touching His Divinity and in the end of the days, for us and our salvation, of the Virgin Mary as touching His humanity; that He is consubstantial with the Father as touching His Divinity and with us as touching His humanity, for two natures have been united (*δύο φύσεων ἕνωσις γέγονε*); moreover, we recognize but one only Christ, one only Son, one only Lord. According to this union without confusion we say that the holy Virgin is Mother of God, for God the Word was incarnate and made man, and from the moment of conception united to Himself the temple which He took from her." The added passage is: "As to the evangelical and apostolical passages relative to the Lord we know that theologians employ some of them without distinction as referring to a single person and distinguish others as referring to two natures; those which are worthy of God when it is a question of the Divinity of Christ, those of a less lofty kind when it is a question of His humanity."

[3] *Synodicon*, 17 (Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 783).

It was a great success for the Easterns, and at the same time the best proof that these people who had just been engaged in such ruthless warfare were upon the whole in accord on fundamental points. Cyril was accepting an Eastern Creed, drawn up, one may suppose, by Theodoret himself: he was even going so far as to make use of the technical terms of the Easterns, speaking of "temple" and of "two natures." There were not wanting those among his own supporters who reproached him for having gone too far in the way of concessions.

He consented, moreover, to forgive the insults which he had received at Ephesus: this greatly moved him, for he often returns to it, with a little too much forgetfulness that he had been the first to begin.

On the other side, the Easterns had to accept the deposition of Nestorius and to condemn his teaching. This was the point which irked; but here Cyril was very strong, for he could count on the support of Constantinople. To satisfy the Court and the new bishop of the capital it would have been enough to declare that the latter had been lawfully elected, the see being vacant by resignation. But it seems clear that Nestorius had not lent himself to this adjustment, and that he was demanding his bishopric again. He had resigned, no doubt; but it was at a time when the Court, accepting the sentences of John's Council exactly as it did those of Cyril's Council, seemed determined by one stroke to remove the two persons who were engaged in controversy—the Bishop of Alexandria and him of Constantinople. Since then the attitude of the Government had undergone a change. It had resumed relations with Cyril: Nestorius alone was sacrificed. We can understand his having protested, having withdrawn his resignation and declared that he did not acknowledge his deposition which had been pronounced in the circumstances with which we are acquainted. Paul of Emesa, by an unwarrantable application of Theodoret's scheme, offered to pronounce in the name of the others the anathemas required. Cyril did not consider that he had in this respect the necessary powers: in his letter John had not breathed a word of it. He admitted Paul to his communion and then sent him back to Syria, escorted by two Alexandrian deacons and by Aristolaus himself. They carried a formulary in

which was expressed the condemnation of Nestorius and of his teaching.[1]

The Patriarch John obtained some modifications of terminology, but he signed, and with him a certain number of his bishops.[2]

Paul of Emesa set out again for Alexandria carrying a letter in which it was said that "for the peace of the Church, for the removal of quarrels and scandals, they recognized Nestorius as deposed, and that they anathematized his empty and profane statements," without further specification.[3] It was peace. Cyril received with open arms the messenger who brought it. He replied by a famous letter[4]: "Let the heavens rejoice and let the earth tremble (with gladness)!" In it he rejected many views which had been wrongly attributed to him, made clear his doctrine, and in order to be completely plain reproduced the confession of Antioch in the form in which John had himself inserted it in his letter, and declared it to be in conformity with his own opinions.

News of this happy ending was immediately given both from Antioch and from Alexandria alike to the Emperor and to Pope Xystus, to Maximian of Constantinople and to the whole episcopate. Pope Xystus testified his joy by highly expressive letters.[5]

All is well that ends well. One might be tempted to

[1] What was meant by the teaching of Nestorius? This point had been in no way defined. It is not doubtful that the Eastern creed accepted by Cyril did not correspond to the belief of Nestorius.

[2] Acacius is not mentioned in the documents of the acceptance nor in those which followed. He must have died about this time. One of his *Chorepiscopi* Balai composed in his honour five Syriac hymns: in the last of these pieces he is represented at his last hour conversing with God on his long life which had come to its end and on the eternity upon which he is entering. The Syriac text is in Overbeck, *S. Ephraemi Opera Selecta*, p. 251 ff; a German version by Bickell, *Ausgewählte Gedichte der syrischen Kirchenvater Cyrillonas, Baläus, etc.* (Kempten, 1872) in the *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter.*

[3] Τὰς φαύλας αὐτοῦ καὶ βεβήλους κενοφωνίας. In the letter of John of Antioch to the Emperor the corresponding terms are: *Depositum sive damnatum habemus Nestorium . . . anathematismo subicientes quaecumque ab eo aliene ac peregrine dicta sunt contra apostolicam doctrinam* (*Synodicon*, 91). It is very vague. It is not said either in what Nestorius had been heretical nor even that he had been so.

[4] *Ep.* 39. [5] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 391, 392.

say here: since they made so much of agreement, could they not have begun by it? But such is not the way of men.

Besides, this peace was in no way definitive. Under the pressure of the Government the leaders had made reciprocal concessions; but these their subordinates had in general rather suffered than accepted. In Egypt Isidore of Pelusium expressed certain apprehensions and exhorted Cyril not to alter his views in order to escape ill usage.[1] It is the only voice of opposition that we hear in Egypt. John of Antioch was conscious of a great many others. When it was learnt that he was going to sign, there was bewilderment in the bishoprics of Cilicia and of Euphratesiana. They accused the Patriarch of having yielded too easily. To accept the deposition of Nestorius by the Cyrillian Council and the legitimate character of that gathering was to admit themselves vanquished, to recognize that since their arrival at Ephesus the Easterns had been schismatics. The opposition was directed by Alexander of Hierapolis: local councils were held, letters were written, exhortations delivered, debates held sometimes, for they were not all of the same opinion. Andrew of Samosata was among the first to be pacified and put himself in communication with his neighbours Acacius of Melitene and Rabbulas of Edessa: the first was a Cyrillian of long standing, the second a recruit, but a very ardent one. Some of them wrote to the Pope: we still possess a letter of the metropolitans of Tyana and of Tarsus, Eutherius and Helladius[2]; it is a document of touching *naïveté*: a report had been spread abroad that Xystus was a man of quite different views from his predecessor Celestine: these good bishops were convinced of it and counted upon the fact.

[1] *Ep.* i. 324. This leads us to think that Aristolaus had something besides exhortations in his wallet, and that if the Bishop of Alexandria had not yielded he could have made him regret it. Liberatus (*Brev.* 8) says that it had been a question of exile: "(Aristolaus) sacram principis deferens Joanni et Cyrillo, in qua comminatus est utrisque Nicomediam exilium, nisi pacem haberent ad invicem." The mention of Nicomedia gives ground for supposing here a confusion between the recollection of these threats of exile and that of the project of a conference mentioned above (p. 259); but it is natural that at such a time the Emperor should have called to his aid all his resources.

[2] Coustant, *op. cit.*, p. 1245.

This opposition, inspired in varying degrees by the sympathy retained for Nestorius and the theological tradition predominant in Syria, was not the only one to cause embarrassment to the Patriarch John. Apollinarianism, but lately cultivated at Antioch with such success, was transforming itself there into Monophysitism. It was an evolution analogous to that which in earlier days had had as its stages Arianism, the doctrine of the Homoiousios and that of the Three Hypostases; or again to that which, at the very time with which we are dealing, was giving a sweeter flavour to Pelagianism, and leading it to that modification which is represented to us by the views of Cassian and of Faustus. Hence Cyril had, even in the immediate circle of his Syrian colleague, men devoted to his doctrines, and even one might say prone to exaggerate them under the stimulus of unceasing controversies. The most notable person in this opposition was a monk of Antioch, Maximus, who figured among the number of the deacons of his church. Cyril, whom he startled by his ardour, was sometimes obliged to restrain it.[1] There were others of them, particularly in the monasteries.

However, Maximian died at Constantinople (April 12, 434), and the Court, without the smallest delay, caused Proclus to be enthroned. The party of Nestorius was in movement[2]: it was held that no delay was possible. It was important also to put an end to the discords which were seething in the jurisdiction of Antioch. The Patriarch John asked for a law; at the same time there was brought to bear upon Theodoret the influence of the most renowned solitaries of his country—Simeon the Stylite, James and Baradatus. The Bishop of Cyrus at last entered into communication with John, who gave him favourable terms and did not oblige him directly to condemn his friend Nestorius. Following Theodoret's example the Cilicians submitted themselves, with the exception of two who were driven from their churches. There were also sent into exile Eutherius of Tyana, Dorotheus of Marcianopolis and a few others.[3] The most severely treated was Alexander of Hierapolis, a venerable and unbending old man, whom neither the entreaties of Theodoret nor the thought of a

[1] *Epp.* 57, 58. [2] *Synodicon*, 150 (Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 929).

[3] Count Irenæus drew up this martyrology later. We still possess it in the *Synodicon*, No. 190 (Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 965). There were in all fourteen recalcitrants, almost all of whom paid cruelly for their opposition.

people by whom he was adored could shake in his resolution. For what he deemed to be righteousness he suffered everything, even to the mines of Egypt, whither he was sent by a severity cruelly excessive.

Nestorius himself, too, felt the force of imperial displeasure. Although, as far back as the year 432, Pope Celestine had expressed the wish that he should not remain at Antioch, he had been tolerated there for a space of four years. In the retirement of his monastery he had still kept up some friendships. No more now than formerly could he succeed in holding his tongue. To his expressions of willingness to resign he had given no sequel. He was incessantly engaged in protest against his pretended deposition. Across the path of negotiations he cast recriminations formulated in the guise of *Memoirs*. For those who had gone back he was a witness of a very troublesome kind. John in the end found him so inconvenient that he asked to be rid of him. He was interned at Petra[1] in Idumæa, a gloomy abode for a man accustomed to great towns. But it was only a passing stay, for they were not slow in finding him a more distant place of exile. He was despatched to the oasis of Ibis,[2] at the end of the Libyan desert. There he was forgotten. In 439, at the time when Socrates was finishing his Ecclesiastical History, it was vaguely believed in Constantinople that he was still living in his place of exile.[3] That was all that they knew about the matter.

All the proscriptions fell upon his head. At the moment when he was starting for exile an imperial law[4] forbade his adherents to call themselves Christians, and inflicted upon them the name of Simonians. His books were proscribed: it was forbidden to read them, to copy them, to keep them: they were to be thrown into the fire. The "Simonians" were forbidden to hold meetings even outside the towns. This was not enough: attacks were made upon the friends of the condemned Nestorius. The Count Irenæus and the priest Photius were banished to Petra,[5] and their goods subjected to confiscation. Further,

[1] Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 255.
[2] The Great Oasis of the ancients, now called the Oasis of Khargeh.
[3] Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 34.
[4] *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 66; *cf.* Mansi, *Conc.* v., pp. 413, 416.
[5] *Synodicon*, 188, 189 (Mansi, *Conc.* v., pp. 964, 965).

since it was notorious that many bishops belonging to the jurisdiction of Antioch, while accepting the peace of 433, had not condemned Nestorius, the tribune and notary Aristolaus returned in 435 to exact more definite signatures: he obtained them. Theodoret—it would have been difficult for it to be otherwise—was now obliged to resign himself and to drink the bitter cup.

It was not Cyril's fault that it was not more bitter still. Learning that new signatures were being demanded of the Easterns, he proposed to add to the formulary certain theological explanations. This time John resisted and the claim was not pressed. What disquieted Cyril was the statement that the Easterns, in spite of their adhesion, were continuing to teach, as they had done formerly, doctrines akin to that of Nestorius. On their side Cyril's opponents were convinced that he allowed the preaching of the passibility of God, and they complained bitterly about it. It is not surprising that in this world so imperfectly reconciled there were made sometimes statements that were exaggerated and that there passed from place to place rumours that were inexact.

The declarations collected by Aristolaus implied the recognition of Proclus as lawful Patriarch of Constantinople. But a new incident occurred.[1] Nestorius, in his clumsy and controversial sermons, had been greatly influenced by Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, celebrated teachers whose memory continued to be held in high honour. The noise of his affair re-awakened curiosity in regard to their books: his supporters appealed to them. In default of his own writings, which first the Church and then the State had not been slow to ban, there were put in circulation again those of his predecessors and masters. Naturally the Cyrillians were disturbed about it. This controversy, strange to say, made its first stir in Persian Armenia, at that time at the height of its literary development. A number of Greek and Syriac books had been translated there under the patronage of the Catholicos Sahag and of the Teacher Mesrob. Those of Theodore of Mopsuestia in such circumstances attracted the attention of the

[1] *Synodicon*, 196-200 (Mansi, *Conc.* v., pp. 971 ff.), Liberatus, *Brev.* c. 10; Facundus, *Pro def. trium capitulorum*, lib. viii., and the documents quoted in the Fifth Œcumenical Council, fifth session, Mansi, *Conc.* ix., pp. 240 ff. *Cf.* Cyril, *Epp.* 66-74.

translators. But the Bishops of Edessa and of Melitene, who were determined Cyrillians, interfered to put them on their guard against these productions which were highly suspect in their eyes. They were still more so, one can well imagine, in the eyes of the Apollinarians, whose views were very fully represented whether in Armenia Magna itself or in the monasteries of the country on its border. In presence of this conflict it occurred to the Bishops of Armenia to address themselves to Constantinople and to consult Proclus, the new bishop.[1] Proclus replied by a long doctrinal exposition,[2] in which is found the formula *Unus de Trinitate incarnatus*, which was better suited to the data of the problem than Cyril's formula, *Una natura Dei Verbi incarnata.* The Armenian bishops had attached to their enquiry a certain number of extracts from Theodore which Proclus did not hesitate to condemn. Not content with having entered into explanations with the Armenians, he thought it worth while to present his exposition to the Easterns, asking them to sign it and to express disapprobation at the same time of the propositions censured in an appendix. A deacon of Constantinople called Basil, seconded at Antioch by another deacon, Maximus, exerted himself on his part to secure the condemnation of Theodore. Cyril being solicited by him,[3] and being besides, needless to say, little disposed to favour the theology of Mopsuestia, was urgent in the same sense. He even wrote a treatise, which is now lost, against Diodore and Theodore.

John of Antioch, however, and the bishops of the Orient who were constantly being asked for signatures, began to weary of it. They consented further to sign the "Tome" of Proclus to the Armenians, but they refused to condemn the passages of Theodore. As a return was made to the attack, they put themselves in opposition and demanded bluntly that they should be left in peace. People were beginning besides to see that it was not from them that the greatest danger was

[1] This enquiry is lost; there remains only the title of it in the fifth session of the Fifth Œcumenical Council (Mansi, *Conc.* ix., p. 240). The text which follows this rubric is derived from another source.

[2] Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 421.

[3] It is a request of Basil either to Cyril or to Proclus which appears in the existing text of the Fifth Council, with a rubric which attributes it to the Bishops of Armenia. *Cf.* p. 269, note 1.

coming. Armenian monks were causing scandal in Constantinople and scouring the provinces: under pretext of inveighing against Theodore, they were protesting against the union of 433, against the weakness of Cyril who confined himself to writing against Theodore and remained in communion with John. They even went so far as to blame him for not having anathematized John by name at the Council of Ephesus.[1] Apollinarianism was awakening once more, was hastening to the prey. It was time to stop this *revanche*. Such was the opinion of Cyril himself and also of Proclus: the Government did what was necessary to calm this effervescence.[2]

Irenæus occupied his exile in writing the history of the whole of this business, or rather in collecting the *dossier* for it, a *dossier* of very considerable extent, comprising several hundreds of documents. He gave it the title of "Tragœdia," a title which discloses the trouble of his spirit. The friend of Nestorius was still in the thick of the conflict; he was fighting with documents as his weapons; and it is not only Cyril and his followers who excite his indignation: the moderates of the Orient, John of Antioch, and Theodoret, also meet with very severe treatment at his hands.[3]

[1] Some fragments of a document emanating from these monks have been preserved in Book II. of the (unedited) Treatise of Pelagius on behalf of the Three Chapters.

[2] Imperial letter to John of Antioch, *Turbam atque tumultum* (*Synodicon*, 219); *cf.* Facundus, *Pro defens*, viii. 3.

[3] The "Tragœdia" of Irenæus is lost in its original form and in its Greek text. We no longer possess it except in extracts, of considerable size, it is true, in a compilation belonging to the next century and formed after the death of Justinian (565) by a Latin clerk, a defender of the Three Chapters. It is entitled *Synodicon*, and this *Synodicon* has come down to us in a MS. of Monte Cassino of which Lupus (Christian Wolf), Baluze, and Mansi (tom. v.) have given editions which are incomplete and imperfect. A good description of the MS. with the supplements which are most indispensable will be found in the *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, tom. ii., pp. 49 ff.; *Florilegium*, pp. 5-47. *Cf.* Maassen, *Quellen* i., p. 733.

CHAPTER XI

THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON

As the result of pressure, and with the aid of certain measures of constraint, the imperial government had succeeded in imposing upon the two religious parties which divided the Orient a species of truce. The fanatics on one side or the other, and Heaven knows there was no lack of them, murmured more or less sullenly; but the leaders, John, Cyril, and Proclus observed an attitude to one another which was correct. Advantage was taken of this breathing space at Constantinople to end a quarrel now of long standing, and to bring back to the Church the remnant of the Johannites. Chrysostom's body was still lying near Comana in the country chapel in which he had been buried. Proclus obtained the Emperor's leave for it to be brought back to Constantinople and to be deposited in the Basilica of the Apostles with those of the other bishops. On January 27, 438, during the night, Chrysostom entered once more in triumph his episcopal city, across the Bosphorus, which was illuminated. The imperial family came to meet the procession: the son of Arcadius and Eudoxia bent low before the coffin of the exile and touched it with his forehead, asking pardon for his parents.[1]

John of Antioch died shortly afterwards,[2] and Cyril made no delay in following him to the other world.[3] He did not carry with him the regrets of the Syrians. A letter, probably apocryphal, which was in circulation at that time under the name of Theodoret,[4] expresses with sufficient accuracy, though in a very bitter fashion, the relief which they felt: "At last,

[1] Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 45; Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 36.

[2] In 441 or 442. [3] June 27, 444.

[4] The letter is addressed to John: which is absurd, since John died before Cyril. It was, however, cited as by Theodoret, and against him, in the Fifth Œcumenical Council (Session 5: Mansi, *Conc.* ix., p. 295).

at last, he is dead, that bad man. . . . His departure gives joy to those who survive; but it will be a grief to the dead. It is to be feared that they will soon have had enough of him and will send him back to us. . . . We must cover his tomb then with a very heavy stone in order that we may never have to see him again."

It was not only in Syria that complaints were made of Cyril. For nearly sixty years either in the person of Theophilus or of his nephew the same family had presided over the religious government of Egypt. So long an administration had not failed to provoke expressions of discontent. To maintain their position as against the Prefects, to sustain their credit at Court, and to bring to a successful conclusion their schemes for exerting influence, the uncle and nephew had been obliged to find a great deal of money: Chrysostom and Nestorius laid a heavy burden on the finances of the Pharaoh, and those on the shoulders of the people who had to pay. Besides, in the course of his management of the business of the Patriarchate, Cyril had not neglected his relations: their fortune was looked upon with unfriendly eyes. Hence the first care of Dioscorus his archdeacon, who had been appointed his successor, was to make them disgorge. He did so in brutal fashion and thus made himself many enemies.[1]

But these were local affairs. The Easterns, if they had foreseen what Dioscorus had in store for them, would not have been so much rejoiced by the disappearance of Cyril. One Pharaoh succeeded another. Neither the ambitious policy of Alexandria, nor the theology which served as its pretext, had been embalmed with the deceased Patriarch: they were speedily to be seen once more in action.

At this moment the position of the Easterns was appreciably better than on the morrow of the Council of Ephesus, and even than it had been after the pacification in 433. The Government had rid them of the embarrassment of Nestorius, not only by removing him physically but by its firm insistence that every one should repudiate him. In doing so it had rendered them, whatever they might think, a very great service. Anathemas present or past no longer fell except upon the oasis where the unhappy man was expiating so hardly his acts of imprudence:

[1] On this, see the complaints brought forward in the third session of the Council of Chalcedon by the clergy of Alexandria.

his former friends remained unscathed. Among themselves factions had ceased: all the Syrian bishops were grouped around the Patriarch of Antioch. The latter, Domnus, the nephew of John and his successor, held the same views as his uncle but in a more resolute fashion. This circumstances seemed to permit him. The see of Edessa which, owing to the defection of Rabbulas, had been in the days of trouble a support for Cyril, was now[1] occupied by Bishop Ibas (Hiba), a man of diametrically opposite views. In the time of Rabbulas, Ibas had figured among the most notable teachers of the "École des Perses." This brotherhood, established at Edessa since Nisibis had been taken from the Romans (363), was a centre of religious instruction for the clergy of the neighbouring state. In it the works of Diodore and of Theodore were held in great honour. Ibas had translated several of them: hence he was not greatly loved by Rabbulas. His opinions, of which he gives evidence in a letter[2] written after the peace of 433, were in the main those of Theodoret. He did not uphold Nestorius: Cyril and his proposed Anathemas filled him with profound distaste; but he considered that everything had been put straight by the Creed of Union in which he saw a set-back for Cyril and Rabbulas.

When he had become bishop his theology was exploited against him alike by those who were displeased by his election and by those who had reason to complain of his administration. Monstrous statements were ascribed to him. "I have no jealousy of Christ," he was reported to have said. "He has become God. I can do the same myself, if I want to."

Ibas, despite his literary productions which were little known outside the Syriac world, could not be of great assistance to the Eastern party. But that party had Theodoret, and Theodoret, especially since the death of Cyril, was the greatest authority in

[1] Since 435: Ibas was installed on August 8 of this year.

[2] The person to whom this letter is addressed is a certain Mari, a Persian (*i.e.*, a subject of the King of Persia), and to put it more exactly belonging to Beth-Ardaschir (Seleucia), who had lived in Roman Syria and had known personally Theodore of Mopsuestia. He was not the Catholicos who bore the name of Abdisô (Ebed-Jesu), that is unless, following a conjecture of M. Labourt (*Le Christianisme dans l'Empire Perse*, p. 133, note 6), one admits that Mari is not a proper name but the equivalent of the Greek Κύριος or of the Latin *Domnus*. The letter of Ibas is in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, Act x. (Mansi, *Conc.* vii., p. 241).

theology in the Greek Orient.[1] The inheritor of the knowledge of Diodore and of Theodore, he had known how to purge it[2] of many incongruous elements, while maintaining at the same time, in face of Alexandrian extravagances, the part of it which was in conformity with the genuine Christian tradition. From this point of view he set the tone of thought around him. If there continued to be between the Alexandrian formulas and the Eastern explanations an opposition which could not be overcome, on the other hand the Easterns had approached very closely to the views which were about to prevail at Rome. To the service of this theology, definite and firmly based, he lent a highly cultivated mind and an eloquence which was greatly appreciated by audiences at Antioch. A native of that great town, and trained in its schools, he did not confine himself so closely to his diocese of Cyrrhos as to prevent his fellow-countrymen having often the pleasure of listening to him. But, and it was in this that he possessed his highest claim to esteem, he was a model Pastor. He knew how to use his high connexions in order to defend his flock against secular acts of oppression; heretics, old and new, readily returned at his exhortations: there is mention of more than 10,000 Marcionites brought back by him to the bosom of the Church. Adored in his episcopal city, known in the 800 parishes of his great diocese and as far as the Persians, whither his letters carried consolation to the persecuted Christians, he found in his life as bishop a firm basis for his external activity. In his youth he had been attracted, like so many others, by the monastic life: the great solitaries of Syria found in him a most enthusiastic admirer. He always kept himself in communication with them, singing their praises in his books, taking their advice, and sometimes—a more difficult matter—inducing them to accept his. Such a man represented merely in himself an ecclesiastical power: he was, for the Orient, a kind of Augustine. Domnus, who was now presiding over the episcopal body in this country, found in him a counsellor of enlightenment and wisdom: he listened to him with readiness, without ever taking umbrage at his superiority.

Since the death of Cyril this body of bishops deemed them-

[1] Autobiographical details in his Letter 81.

[2] The greater part of the writings of Theodoret are later than the quarrel between Nestorius and Cyril.

selves, to a greater extent than reason warranted, in security. A remarkable indication of the state of their minds is the elevation of Count Irenæus, the former friend of Nestorius, to episcopal rank and to the position of metropolitan of Tyre. Irenæus must have regained favour with the Emperor, for they would not have looked for him in a place of exile in order to make him bishop: as for his doctrine Domnus and his colleagues would not have ordained him had he not given the assurances which were indispensable. He had been married twice; but this was passed over, and the new bishop was recognized not only in the jurisdiction of Antioch but also in Asia Minor and at Constantinople. Proclus sent him a recognition in writing.[1]

Between the Easterns and the bishop of the capital relations were excellent; they interchanged mutual good offices. Proclus would not have had the spirit of his position if he had not endeavoured, by all possible means, to extend the influence of his see. Despite his friendly relations with the Pope he did not cease from encroachments in Illyria. Xystus III. protested in vain[2]: the Patriarch took care that a law of 421 which was favourable on this point to the pretensions of Constantinople should be inserted in the Theodosian Code promulgated in 438. In Asia Minor, just as in Illyria, he intervened in episcopal elections and in ecclesiastical proceedings. The Easterns for whom, in the preceding years, the bishops of that country had been almost all of them opponents, had no inclination to protect them against their interfering neighbour. They left them alone, and even gave an approval sufficiently explicit to cause Dioscorus to reproach them in lively terms: "You are betraying," he said, "the rights of Antioch and of Alexandria."[3]

When Proclus died, in July 446, he was succeeded by one of his priests, Flavian, a man of moderate views, readily prone to hold himself aloof from theological parties, but more favourable than his predecessor to the formulas of the Easterns. For this reason or for others Dioscorus regarded him with dislike.

In course of time a certain shifting took place in Court influences. The Empress Athenais Eudocia,[4] who had for

[1] Theodoret, *Ep.* 110.

[2] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 395, 396: letters belonging to 437. *Vide supra*, p. 212.

[3] Theodoret, *Ep.* 86.

[4] A daughter of the Athenian rhetor Leontius, beautiful and very well read, Athenais was still a pagan when she had been presented by

some years been on bad terms with her husband, was living in retirement at Jerusalem. The credit of Pulcheria had been at last exhausted: the good and weak Theodosius II. was now guided by his Grand Chamberlain Chrysaphius, who had held office since 441. Among those whom this great personage assisted with his favour, the monk Eutyches, his godfather, was in the first rank, and this, in view of the popularity of Eutyches in the monastic world and his Alexandrian connexions, might have and did actually have consequences of the utmost gravity.

Down to this time the Court of Theodosius II. had followed, in the main, the same line as the Bishop of Constantinople. It had aided Nestorius down to the time when he had appeared incapable of being supported, down to the time when Rome, by the authority of its legates, had formally condemned him. Subsequently it had shown much energy and persistence in rendering him harmless in himself, and in rooting out all opposition which, claiming to derive from him, might have disturbed his successors. The Easterns having ended by complying with this policy, there was no reason for not treating them with good-will. This was all that was desired at Rome, where there had been a considerable decline from the enthusiasm shown at first for Cyril. Neither at Rome nor at Constantinople was there any concern for the special success of the Alexandrian theology. The peace of 433 had placed the Faith in security: the fate of the proposed Anathemas would be as pleased God.

All would have been well if they had not had to reckon with Alexandria. But the Egyptian Pope was not a negligible quantity, resting as he did on the support of his docile body of bishops, and strong in the prestige which he exercised over the monks of his own country and of everywhere else. While engaged in settling accounts with the kinsfolk of Cyril, Dioscorus kept his eye on the general course of affairs. He quickly perceived that, through Chrysaphius and Eutyches, the Emperor, who no longer listened to Pulcheria, might be

Pulcheria to her brother Theodosius II. She was baptized by the Patriarch Atticus and then took the name Eudocia: the marriage took place on June 7, 421. After the birth of her daughter Eudoxia, the future bride of Valentinian III., she had been proclaimed Augusta (January 2, 423). Some compositions of hers in verse still survive.

withdrawn from the influence of the Pope of Rome and of the Bishop of Constantinople, and led little by little to submit to the guidance of Alexandria.

Eutyches in his great monastery, where more than three hundred monks lived under his rule, was making copious dissertations on theology. For this he should not be blamed: all monks, all persons of devotion did the same. That he was hostile to the views of Antioch went without saying, since he had fought so long under the banner of Cyril. But he did not confine himself to the doctrine of the Anathemas, to the "natural" union (*l'union physique*, ἕνωσις φυσική) and the one nature (*unique nature*, μία φύσις) of the Word Incarnate. He challenged entirely the view that the humanity of Christ was a humanity like ours or, in technical language, that Christ was "consubstantial" with other men.

The contentions of this holy old man, one of the greatest celebrities of contemporary asceticism, and since the death of Dalmatius (*c.* 440) the moral leader of all the monks of Constantinople, the godfather and spiritual director of the favourite eunuch, could not be treated as drivellings without importance. We have seen above what agitation had been caused a few years before by the monks of Armenia. Eutyches had a long arm. Not to speak of Egypt, which was devoted to him, in the Orient every element of disguised Apollinarians and of Monophysites was in union and even in correspondence with him. Through Uranius, Bishop of Himeria in Osrhoene, he supported the opposition against Ibas of Edessa. The monk Maximus,[1] who had shown himself so zealous at Antioch against Diodore and Theodore, was one of his friends and was even regarded as having inspired him with his doctrine. Other agents, prominent among whom was a solitary named Barsumas, were drawing up documents against Domnus, Theodoret, and others, denouncing at Constantinople their least important proceedings and stirring up for them on the spot unceasing controversies. To leave Eutyches alone was to lay oneself open to the danger of seeing inculcated, from one end of the Empire to the other, a teaching in which the historical reality of the Gospel, often compromised by mystical fantasies, would have foundered altogether.

This monk, however, was so powerful that it was not at

[1] *Supra*, p. 266.

all easy to attack him. The Easterns had the courage to do so.[1] In 447 Theodoret published his *Eranistes* (Beggarman), a celebrated dialogue in which, without mentioning anyone by name, he attacks Eutyches and his doctrine.[2] Eutyches, as we may well believe, held in detestation the writings of Diodore and of Theodore. Like his predecessor John, Domnus betook himself energetically to their defence, and in a letter addressed to the Emperor[3] in the name of his synod he protested against the slanders of the monk, accusing him of renewing the "impiety" of Apollinaris, of teaching the "One Nature," the confusion of the humanity and the Divinity, finally of attributing to the Divinity the sufferings of Christ.

Domnus had presumed too much upon his strength. On February 16, 448,[4] appeared an imperial rescript with an edict of the Prætorian Prefects. It renewed the proscription of the writings of Porphyry and of Nestorius, and then extended it to all works which were not in conformity with the Faith set forth by the Councils of Nicæa and Ephesus as well as by Bishop Cyril, of pious memory. The partisans of Nestorius were to be removed from the positions they might hold among the clergy or excommunicated in the case of laymen. By way of an impressive illustration the Emperor ordered Irenæus, who had been "promoted, in some unknown fashion, Bishop of Tyre" to abandon this bishopric and resume secular attire.

It was impossible to be more brutal or to trench more openly on the domain of religion. By the authority of the

[1] Facundus, *Pro defens.* xii. 5, "Domnus Antiochenus, qui . . . Eutychi Apollinaris heresiarchae impietatem renovare tentanti et ob hoc Diodorum atque Theodorum anathematizare praesumenti *primus* restitit, ad imperatorem Theodosium scribens."

[2] It is divided into three books entitled Ἄτρεπτος, Ἀσύγχυτος, Ἀπαθής, corresponding to the three errors of the mutability of God, of the confusion of the Natures, of the passibility of God. Theodoret makes much use in it of the holy Fathers, of whom he quotes many passages. He published later a second edition of his book, with new citations borrowed from a collection formed by Pope Leo. *Cf.* Saltet, "Les Sources de l'Eraniste de Théodoret" in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. vi.

[3] Facundus, *op. cit.* viii. 5.

[4] Mansi, *Conc.* v., p. 417. Cf. *Cod. Justin.* I., i. 3. The text of the collections of Councils is more complete than that of the Code, but gives no date beyond that of a reading of this document which took place on April 18, 448, in a monastic church in the Egyptian deserts.

Emperor a bishop instituted by the regular authorities was deposed from his see: the Formula of Union of 433 was repudiated, and Cyril, together it must be understood with his Anathemas, was elevated to the position of regulator of orthodoxy. The Emperor Constantius had not done worse. The Easterns felt the blow. Others, besides, followed without delay. Ibas found himself threatened by a suit which certain clergy of Edessa initiated against him. Uranius of Himeria was the guiding spirit of this cabal. Rebuffed at Antioch by the Patriarch's methods of procrastination, the accusers transferred themselves to Constantinople. In the course of this affair a body of monks, under the leadership of a certain Theodosius, departed to Alexandria[1] to raise a clamour against Domnus and Theodoret. Dioscorus scarcely needed to be stirred up against these personages. He had long been in close alliance with Eutyches. Theodoret,[2] at the outset, affected not to notice their intrigues, and endeavoured to remove the prejudices of the Bishop of Alexandria. The latter put upon himself less and less restraint: he wrote to Domnus in the most arrogant of tones, demanding explanations of the sermons of the Bishop of Cyrrhos and of the vacancy of the see of Tyre which the Patriarch of Antioch pretended to ignore. Theodoret at last received from the Court an order to remain in his episcopal residence on the pretext that he was organizing too many synods at Antioch.[3] As for the see of Tyre provision was made, undoubtedly without reference to the Patriarch. Irenæus was replaced by a certain Photius.[4]

In this way the unhappy Easterns were threatened both from Alexandria and from Constantinople. It was not the fault of Eutyches that Rome did not come into line against them. He had the effrontery to write to Pope Leo to stir him to action against the efforts of reviving Nestorianism. Leo replied evasively.[5] He had a presentiment, no doubt, that trouble was brewing in the Orient.

The crisis was hastened by an event of a quite unexpected

[1] Martin, *Actes du brigandage d'Ephèse*, pp. 153, 168.

[2] *Epp.* 83-86. [3] *Epp.* 79-82.

[4] September 9, 448, a date supplied by the Syriac Acts of the "Robber-Synod" of Ephesus (Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 143).

[5] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 418 (June 1, 448).

kind. Eutyches was arraigned before the tribunal of the Bishop of Constantinople. Flavian had hitherto succeeded in tacking about between the intrigues of the Monophysite party and his personal sympathies with the theology of the Easterns. It was with surprise mingled with terror that he found himself suddenly confronted with a formal accusation against the all-powerful monk. The accuser was that same Eusebius, now Bishop of Dorylæum, who while still a layman had been the first to dare to attack Nestorius. He was a man of litigious and headstrong temper. Flavian did his utmost to get rid of a controversy which he judged to be fraught with peril. But Eusebius held his ground: he protested that the Faith was at stake, and so far prevailed that Flavian and his Council sent in search of Eutyches.

They had considerable difficulty in securing the presence of the holy man. He entrenched himself behind his vow of seclusion, urged his state of ill-health, multiplied one difficulty after another. But Eusebius had no intention of letting him slip. A report was spread abroad that Eutyches was endeavouring to organize a demonstration of all the monasteries: this was more of a character to compromise him. To cut the story short, in the end he presented himself, on November 22, 448, escorted by a multitude of monks and officials: the presence of the latter signified in the eyes of all the protection of the Chamberlain Chrysaphius. They even went so far as to inflict upon the Council the presence of one of the highest dignitaries of the Empire, the Patrician Florentius, who took an effective part in the discussion. When questioned as to his doctrine, Eutyches refused to give the satisfactory explanations that were asked. He had an extreme repugnance to the Two Natures. While recognizing that Christ had taken His humanity from the Virgin Mary His Mother, he could not admit that by this humanity He was consubstantial with us. It was the humanity of God: it re-entered, in some way, into the one nature (*unique nature*, μία φύσις) of the Word Incarnate. He consented on this occasion to say what they asked him to say, but not to censure the opinions which he had professed hitherto. It was in vain that the Patrician Florentius himself exhorted him, and with urgency, to profess the Two Natures. Nothing could make him give way. The Council deposed him from the priesthood as well as from his office of archimandrite

and excommunicated him, at the same time forbidding everyone to have intercourse with him.[1]

The blow was a severe one, and it was not only on Eutyches that it fell. The question of the Two Natures in Jesus Christ had never been handled with such clear-cut definiteness: no conciliar authority had as yet imposed the Diphysite formula as a condition of orthodoxy. To ask Eutyches to profess it without qualifications was perhaps to go too far. Undoubtedly the subject of the Two Natures had been raised in the Formula of Union of 433, but either indirectly or with circumlocutions. Cyril who had recognized this Formula had not on that account ceased to reproduce his own special formula, "One is the Incarnate Nature of the Word." There existed, as it were, two Cyrillian terminologies, the one which Cyril tolerated among the Easterns, the other which he made use of for himself, naturally because he thought it better than the other.[2] His own might no doubt be brought over to that of the Easterns by means of explanations tending to represent the word "Incarnate" as signifying in another way the second nature, the human nature. But these explanations could not be other than very far-fetched: from the moment that it is desired to express belief in the duality of Natures, the best course is not to begin by saying that there is but one. Besides, it was not Cyril who had made a struggle to bring over his theology to that of the Easterns: quite the contrary. They put to him, to him too, the question of the Two Natures. He recognized that, strictly speaking, one can talk of the "nature of the humanity;" but he mistrusted this formula, which according to him only serves to mask the idea of the human hypostasis. In fine he only admits the Two Natures in an ideal fashion, in a kind of logical anteriority to the Incarnation: "the one Christ results from the union of the Two Natures"; after the Incarnation it was better not to speak save of a single Nature incarnate.

For Flavian and his Council, as for Eutyches, Cyril was assuredly a great authority. But, as can be seen, there were two Cyrils, the real, natural Cyril, the Cyril of the One Nature, and it is this Cyril whom Eutyches invoked on his side though he went beyond him; and the Cyril as diplomatist, the Cyril of

[1] Mansi, *Conc.* vi., p. 747.

[2] See for this his two letters to Successus (*Epp.* 45, 46).

safeguards and forced concessions, and this is the Cyril whom Flavian had in mind. The first was represented by the proposed Anathemas as well as by the letters to Acacius of Melitene and to Successus; the other by the Dogmatic Letter to Nestorius (Καταφλυαροῦσι) and by that in which he accepts the Formula of Union.[1] It is necessary to insist on this distinction: it was made at Rome too; for nearly a hundred years it governed opinion there in regard to the doctrine of the famous Bishop of Alexandria and on the use to be made of his writings.

We can see how delicate the position was for the orthodox who were obliged to accept Cyril and to combat in his disciples not only those disciples' exaggerations but the favourite formulas of their master. A little exercise of criticism would have delivered them from embarrassment. It would not have been difficult to make an investigation into the authorities on whom Cyril depended, those celebrated passages of St Gregory the Wonder-worker, of Popes Felix and Julius, of St Athanasius, and to show that in these spurious documents it was Apollinarianism which was finding expression and not the tradition of the Church. This task was effectively discharged in the following century.[2] It might have been accomplished in the time of Cyril or of Flavian, with the result that many religious misunderstandings would have been avoided. Nothing of the sort happened. Apollinarian texts figure at the Council of Ephesus among the documents of the Faith; Eutyches could adduce with sincerity to Pope Leo a letter of his predecessor Julius, as formally conceived as possible against the dogma of the Two Natures.

But there was one point where the old monk was certainly in advance of the Alexandrian theology, and in disagreement with it: it was when he said that Christ is not consubstantial with us. It was as much as to say that He is not man. Under pretext of raising Him as much as possible, of laying greater stress upon His Divinity, Eutyches made of Him a being absolutely stranger to humanity. Hence it is not astonishing that he was treated as an Apollinarian and even as a Valentinian. In reality he was neither the one nor the

[1] *Supra*, pp. 233 and 264. These two documents were read officially at Flavian's Council, to the exclusion of the letter with the Anathemas.

[2] Leontius (?), *Contra fraudes Apollinaristarum* (Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, lxxxvi., p. 1947).

other; but with the excessive logic in vogue in controversies, it was possible to drive him to conclusions analogous to these heresies. And this is the explanation of the fact that the Monophysites in their turn were also able to launch at him their Anathemas, while at the same time protesting as he did against the Two Natures.

Already in the course of the discussion he seems to have said in regard to the Two Natures, "If my Fathers of Rome and Alexandria enjoin it upon me, I am ready to affirm them."[1] The hearing had come to an end when he announced to the Patrician Florentius, who informed Flavian of the fact, that he would carry the sentence to the "Councils" of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Thessalonica.[2] The Bishop of Constantinople did not consider this as a formal appeal, and certainly not as a suspensory appeal: the heads of the monasteries[3] were required to accept the condemnation of Eutyches. They lent themselves to what was asked of them. However, in his own monastery, the condemned archimandrite was vigorously upheld by his disciples. He himself made his protest by means of notices posted up.

But it was not only at Constantinople that the sound of the blow was heard. In the Orient, Domnus and his party felt themselves strengthened once more. The accusers of Ibas, tossed without result from Antioch to Constantinople, from Constantinople to Antioch, had ended by securing the constitution, the highly irregular constitution, of a tribunal of arbitration upon which appeared, in company with Eustathius, the Bishop of Berytus, Photius, the new Metropolitan of Tyre, and the Bishop of Himeria, Uranius, who was a suffragan of Ibas and his bitter enemy. But they failed. Ibas defended himself: his clergy came in force to dispute the statements attributed to him and to justify his administration. The debate ended with a general reconciliation, more or less sincere, and the Bishop of Edessa returned to his diocese for the Easter festival of the year 449.

Whilst in the Orient there was a state of rejoicing, the aged

[1] Mansi, *Conc.* vi., p. 817.

[2] The omission of Antioch is to be noted.

[3] There are twenty-three signatures of archimandrites following those of the bishops who had sat as judges at the Council (Mansi, *Conc.* vi., p. 752).

Eutyches was once more weaving a web and Dioscorus was busying himself in helping him. Chrysaphius also was setting himself in motion. Flavian and Eutyches had written to Rome: the monk's protest arrived there first; it was supported by a letter of the Emperor Theodosius II.[1] Eutyches had not forgotten the Court of Ravenna: a letter of his, written to Peter Chrysologus, the eloquent bishop of the Italian capital, was destined to secure for him there some useful expressions of sympathy. Peter replied to him, deploring these controversies which were incessantly coming to life again and urging his correspondent to take the advice of the Roman Pope.

During the twenty years that these questions were agitating the Church, people had set themselves at Rome to make a serious study of them. In the past they had relied upon the reports of Cassian and of Marius Mercator; they had confused, or come very near to confusing, the views of Nestorius with the system of Paul of Samosata. Marius Mercator, it is true, continued to live at Constantinople. Always embittered against Nestorius and his followers, he continued his campaign of pamphlets and of partisan translations, defaming in Latin the dead and the living, Diodore and Theodore, Ibas, Theodoret and Eutherius of Tyana. He was a Cyrillian of the most uncompromising type: there was no use talking to him of the Two Natures. But the time had gone by when his anti-Pelagian fervour could win him credit at Rome. Prosper, another zealous disciple of Augustine, was making an exhaustive study of the doctrine of the Incarnation and of its traditional documents. A dogmatic theologian himself, and one of the most acute, Pope Leo had no need to rely upon the knowledge of others and to put himself at the discretion of the Bishops of Alexandria. Whatever efforts were made, he did not allow himself to have his doctrine given him. When he had before his eyes all the documents of the affair of Eutyches, and especially the formal records of the synod, he had no difficulty in recognizing that the Bishop of Constantinople had decided well and that the doctrine of Eutyches was inadmissible. He held, too, that some of his assertions upon which stress had not been laid ought to have been corrected as soon as made. "What did he mean by professing Two Natures before the union, one only after it? It was exactly the

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 420-423.

contrary. Before the union there was only the Divine Nature: after it, there was the Divine Nature and the human Nature, united without confusion."

Whilst Leo was reflecting upon the situation it was undergoing a transformation at Constantinople. The Emperor Theodosius II., disgusted at this new affair, had endeavoured in vain to bring about a reconciliation between the monk and the bishop. Flavian, to whom were offered only guarantees which were insufficient, remained inflexible. The Court had reason to surmise that Rome was little disposed to extend patronage to Eutyches: hence it was decided, on the latter's representations and on the basis of his appeal which was more or less settled, that the matter should be carried before an œcumenical council. It was appointed for August 1, again at Ephesus. The letters of summons[1] gave a clear indication of the intention with which it was being brought together. Theodoret was told not to take part in it: on the other hand one of his most notorious opponents, the Archimandrite Barsumas, was specially summoned as a representative of the religious of the Orient, oppressed in their own country by bishops who were partisans of Nestorius. To counteract the intrigues of Theodoret and his friends, Dioscorus was nominated as president of the council: he was to be assisted by Juvenal of Jerusalem and Thalassius of Cæsarea, men who could be relied upon.

While waiting for the date fixed for the opening of the assembly, an official enquiry was instituted at Constantinople in regard to the formal records of the Council in November, in which Eutyches alleged that falsifications had been made. They were not proved. The deposition was also taken of an official who said that before the appearance of Eutyches he had seen his sentence drawn up in advance in the possession of Bishop Flavian. Finally the Emperor exacted from the latter a profession of faith. It was unwarrantable, but Flavian had to comply. It was clear that there was being prepared for the monk a revenge of the most impressive kind.

An enquiry was also held at Edessa. The governor of Osrhoene, Chereas, was charged with the task of restoring to its former condition a situation which had become too favourable to Ibas. Before this high commissioner, only

[1] Mansi, *Conc.* vi., pp. 588 ff.

members of the opposing party could secure a hearing; to the depositions, so often challenged, of the enemies of the bishop were added the clamourings of a rabble excited against him.[1] Ibas was removed from Edessa and thrown into prison.[2]

However, Pope Leo had received, about May 12, an invitation to the Council. The case did not seem to him to be worth such a marshalling of episcopal forces. He excused himself personally, as much on the ground of lack of precedent as on that of the threatening position in which Italy was placed: Attila was at its gates. He confined himself to sending legates, to whom he entrusted a whole series of letters—to the Emperors, to Flavian, to the Council, to the monks of Constantinople.[3] The most important, the one to which all the others make reference for matters of detail, is one of those that he addressed to Flavian.[4] It is the famous Tome of Leo, of which there will be so much to be said later. The doctrine of the Incarnation is there expressed in terms simple and precise: Two Natures, in the unity of a single Person; two true Natures, capable of action and each acting on its own account, in agreement of course, and in co-operation.[5]

The Tome of Leo was the condemnation not only of Eutyches, but of the Alexandrian theory, at any rate in the excessive and exclusive form given to it by those who at that time held it. Like the sentence of the Council of Constantinople, the Pope's definition placed itself on the ground of the Act of Union of 433, that is to say on the same ground as the Easterns, Theodoret, Domnus, and the rest. It was even much more plain: not having to reckon with the dislikes of anyone, Leo affirmed the Two Natures, clearly and without ambiguities. As for the person of Eutyches, he urged that tenderness should be shown to the aged Archimandrite, provided that he retracted his errors.

[1] See the formal records in the Syriac Acts (Martin, *Actes du brigandage d'Ephèse*, pp. 15-60).

[2] Mansi, *Conc.* vii., p. 204 (a corrupt text).

[3] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 423-432. The majority belong to June 13, 449, the last to July 23, the two preceding to June 20.

Jaffé, *op. cit.* 423, *Lectis dilectionis.*

[5] "In integra veri hominis perfectaque natura verus natus est Deus, totus in suis, totus in nostris. . . . Agit utraque forma (forma Dei, forma servi) cum alterius communione quod proprium est."

Retract his errors! There was a fine prospect of that. Eutyches was marching to triumph.

He was to be seen among the first to arrive, escorted by a considerable body of monks; Barsumas brought others of them from Mesopotamian Syria. The latter were scarcely acquainted with Greek, and their theology, one may suppose, was somewhat limited. On the other hand they could be relied upon if there were any occasion for howling or bludgeoning. It was a reinforcement for the Patriarch of Alexandria, who, in addition, had not failed to put on board with himself a reasonable number of Parabolani of vigour and devotion.

The Roman legates had set out from Italy four in number—Julius the Bishop of Puteoli and three members of the Roman clergy, the priest Renatus, the deacon Hilary, the notary Dulcitius. Renatus died on the journey, at Delos. On landing at Ephesus the three others at once put themselves into communication with Flavian, who had himself also arrived. It was for him that they had letters and not for the Bishop of Alexandria. They had some also for the Council.

This had been summoned one morning (August 8) by Dioscorus, without previous notice: it met forthwith in the cathedral. Dioscorus presided, elevated upon an imposing throne: at his sides there took their places Julius of Puteoli, head of the Roman delegation, then Juvenal, Domnus, and Flavian.[1] There were about 130 bishops, for the most part devoted to Dioscorus, and ready to do what he should ask them. He had brought a score of them from his own Egypt; Juvenal some fifteen from Palestine, equally amenable. From Syria there were almost as many, but for the most part picked with care and selected among those who offered opposition to the Patriarch. The latter in the absence of Theodoret and Ibas, the one interned in his diocese, the other imprisoned, found himself very much deserted: his attitude showed it.

The legates of Rome brought in their letters the condemnation of Eutyches; but it was not Pope Leo who was going to direct the Council. Dioscorus himself had only to figure there as an executive officer. Everything had been decided at Constantinople. Two officials, the Count Helpidius with the tribune and notary Eulogius, had been delegated to ensure external order and the execution of the Emperor's programme.

[1] Order of seniority, without regard to the rank of the sees.

From their instructions,[1] couched in general terms, needless to say, but in which it is easy to read between the lines, it follows that this programme involved two points—the rehabilitation of Eutyches, and next the deprivation equally of Flavian and of all the bishops suspected of Nestorianizing. The prelates who had sat as judges in the case at Constantinople might be present at the re-hearing but without giving any vote. The same exclusion had been pronounced against others to such an extent that there were 42 bishops who only appeared at the Council in the rôle of spectators.[2]

The session opened with the reading of the imperial letters. After the first the legate Julius asked that the letters of Pope Leo should also be read; Dioscorus pretended to acquiesce. But there were still other imperial letters: it was certainly necessary to read them. Again and again the Bishop of Puteoli renewed his request: it was always evaded. He ought to have protested and taken his departure. Isolated in the midst of this assembly[3] whose language he did not speak, and which by a large majority was hostile to him, looked at askance by the presidents and by the officers of the Emperor, having on his side only men who were accused and against whom everything was let loose, he lost his head a little and allowed himself to be drawn into following a discussion which he ought either to have cut short or to have directed.[4]

The will of the Emperor having been communicated to the Council, it hastened to conform to it. They accordingly turned their attention to the Faith. The question of Faith, or so at least Dioscorus gave the Council to understand,[5] was

[1] Mansi, *Conc.* vi., pp. 596-597. [2] *Ibid.* p. 605.

[3] The deacon Hilary was present, it is true; but as he had been placed after the bishops he must have found himself far removed from Julius and quite unable to act in concert with him. If the priest Renatus, in reality the most important member of the legation, had been at Ephesus it is possible that the course of things would have been different.

[4] It is not easy to understand at first how the Roman legates could accept the presidency of Dioscorus, when they themselves were present. But such was the order of the Emperor. Besides, it was inconvenient to place the direction of an assembly in the hands of people who did not speak the language. Lastly there was the precedent of the Council of 431, in which Cyril, not content with awarding himself the office of president, had not even taken the trouble to wait for the arrival of the Roman legates.

[5] Such is, moreover, the true sense of the imperial letter in which the

the question of ascertaining whether Eutyches had deserved to be condemned by Flavian. The monk was brought in, presented his application and his profession of faith, and then the Acts of the Council of Constantinople were read.[1] When they came to the place where Eutyches had been called upon to profess the Two Natures, shouts of rage were raised: "Eusebius to the flames. Burn him alive! Cut him in two pieces this man who divides the Christ!" Eutyches' profession: "Two Natures before the union, only one afterwards" was highly approved: "That is what we all believe," declared Dioscorus. In short, Eutyches was declared orthodox and re-established in his positions as priest and archimandrite. His monks were equally relieved of the censures which their bishop had inflicted upon them.

Some objections seem to have been raised either during the session or before it. Dioscorus put them to silence. In his arrogant and threatening language there were constant references to deposition, exile, even worse. His *entourage* talked of nothing less than throwing opposers into the sea.

After having absolved in this way the persons who had been condemned at Constantinople, they turned their attention to the judges. The president caused long extracts of the preceding Council of Ephesus to be read, in which it was forbidden, on pain of deposition, to put forward and to teach any other creed than that of Nicæa. Every one approved, including the Roman legates, who had no more suspicion than the rest of the use which was about to be made of this document. Suddenly Dioscorus declared that Flavian and Eusebius with their formula of the Two Natures had infringed this regulation and merited deposition. This unexpected conclusion awakened lively opposition. "I appeal," protested Flavian; "Contradicitur!" cried the Roman deacon. Some bishops left their seats,[2] approached the president and threw themselves at his knees, entreating him and representing to

question of faith is opposed not in general to questions as to persons, but only to questions of temporal administration.

[1] It was in vain that Flavian, supported by the legates, demanded the presence of Eusebius of Dorylæum, as having been the accuser of Eutyches. Count Helpidius, in the name of the Emperor, opposed his appearance.

[2] Council of Chalcedon, Acts I. and IV. (Mansi, *Conc.* vi., p. 829; vii., p. 68).

him the enormity of what he was doing. Dioscorus pretended to consider himself threatened. He rose hastily and cried, "Where are the Counts?" The Counts appeared and caused the doors of the church to be opened. The Proconsul of Asia, who was waiting outside, entered with military police, armed and brandishing manacles. After them rushed in the multitude of monks, Parabolani, Egyptian sailors, and other disorderly persons. We can judge of the disturbance. Flavian made an effort to reach the altar and to cling to it: the soldiers surrounded him, tried to hinder his purpose, wished to drag him outside the church. Hustled, bruised, pursued by cries threatening his life, the unhappy man had great difficulty in finding a place of refuge for himself and those with him. There, eluding the watchfulness of his guards, he drew up a formal appeal which was handed to the legates.[1] Eusebius also, who had tried in vain to make his way into the assembly, was kept a prisoner under observation.

However, Dioscorus and Juvenal were taking the votes. The Basilica was closed once more: no one could leave it. Each of the bishops must put his adhesion in form and give his signature. A large number did so readily. Others hesitated: to the cry of conscience were opposed within them the suggestions of fear, the menaces of the terrible Patriarch, the military display, the vociferations of the monks and of the crowd. All gave way, all of them, including the unhappy Bishop of Antioch. The Egyptian notaries took down their words: for greater convenience in drawing up the formal record, the signatures were appended on blank leaves. All this has come down to us, for the reading of it took place, two years later, at the Council of Chalcedon. The Alexandrian chancery had edited the wording a little and protests were not wanting; but regarded as a whole it remains established that in these lamentable sessions the Greek Episcopate exhibited, to say the least, a deplorable meanness of spirit.

After this first session,[2] Dioscorus despatched a report to the

[1] *Neues Archiv*, vol. xi. (1886), p. 362. To this document was or ought to be joined a more circumstantial *relatio* of what had passed at the Council.

[2] That all this took place on the same day is the inference now made from the letter of appeal addressed to Pope Leo by Flavian (*Neues Archiv* xi., p. 364).

Emperor. Whether because he waited for a reply or for another reason, fifteen days elapsed without a fresh meeting of the bishops. On August 22 another sitting was held, this time in the absence, not only of Flavian and Eusebius, but also of the Roman legates, who refused to appear again, and of Domnus who was ill.[1] It was devoted to settling the accounts of Dioscorus and his friends with those of the Eastern bishops who most attracted their hostility. They began with Ibas, who was deposed with his nephew Daniel of Haran. Then they turned to Irenæus of Tyre, who had been replaced already without having been the subject of a formal sentence: he was deprived, and with him a suffragan whom he had consecrated, Aquilinus of Byblos.[2] Then came the turn of Theodoret: he too was deposed. All these sentences which affected persons subject to the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Antioch were notified to him. He had the heart to give his assent. This baseness did not save him. After the others he too was tried as contumacious, and deposed. The Council ended its proceedings by the solemn acceptance of the proposed Anathemas of Cyril.[3]

Cyril, in fact, on this day got the better of all his adversaries: his theology carried the day, in bad company it is true, and by dint of very deplorable methods. Dioscorus and Juvenal,

[1] Martin, *Actes du brigandage d'Ephèse*, pp. 8-10.

[2] They remitted to the next Bishop of Edessa the matter of Sophronius, Bishop of Tella, one of his suffragans. He was accused of witchcraft: the *dossier* of this case contains, on this subject, some very curious details.

[3] Of the Council of Ephesus in 449 (*Latrocinium Ephesinum*) we still possess: (1) the original formal record of the first session, that of August 8, inserted in that of the first session of the Council of Chalcedon; (2) a Syriac version of the proceedings against Ibas, Theodoret, Domnus, and others. In 1873 G. Hoffmann had already given a German translation of them in a Kiel University Programme; in 1874 the Abbé P. Martin published a French translation of them in the *Revue des Sciences ecclésiastiques* of Amiens (it is this translation which I quote, from a *tirage à part*); in 1877 S. G. Perry edited the Syriac text and some documents annexed to it; he republished it in 1881 with an English version (*The Second Synod of Ephesus, together with certain extracts relating to it*, Dartford). It is possible that everything happened in two sessions, that of August 8 and that of the 22nd. The affairs of Ibas and others down to that of Theodoret inclusively were certainly dealt with on the same day (*Actes du brig.*, pp. 126, 131). Strictly speaking that of Domnus might be referred to another day; but it is not necessary.

Eutyches and Barsumas, carried him in triumph and acclaimed him noisily.

However, Theodoret was not dead. By confining him in his far-off bishopric, the imperial police had kept him at a distance and in safety from the brutal violence of the monks. It was to be expected that he would be heard of. A powerful voice, the voice of Pope Leo, was soon to be raised in his favour. Thanks to the manœuvres of Dioscorus, it had not been able to make itself heard at the Council: it was no fault of Chrysaphius and his agents that the legates were not detained in Asia, and that thus Leo would not have been informed. But the deacon Hilary hoodwinked all attempts to keep an eye on him and succeeded in discovering the road to Rome. He brought thither, together with trustworthy information,[1] the written appeal of Flavian. Eusebius of Dorylæum had also appealed: his protest was confided by him to two of his clergy, who carried it to Rome. They speedily saw him arrive in person and finally some priests of Theodoret, with a third letter of appeal, addressed to the Pope by their bishop.

On receiving the first tidings Leo hastened to take action. Surrounded by a certain number of Italian bishops[2] he made a lively protest against what had just taken place at Ephesus. Letters in this sense were immediately despatched to the sovereigns of the East, Theodosius and Pulcheria, to Flavian, to the clergy, and to the faithful monks of Constantinople. It was not possible to inculpate the Emperor and his ministers, the true culprits: the Pope casts the whole responsibility on the Bishop of Alexandria, censures and annuls all that has been

[1] It was not without difficulty that Hilary escaped from Dioscorus and his people. When he became Pope he caused to be constructed on the sides of the Baptistery of the Lateran two chapels, one of which, under the title of St John the Evangelist, still exists. We read on the lintel of the door the inscription:—

LIBERATORI SVO BEATO IOHANNI
EVANGELISTAE HILARIVS EPISCOPVS
FAMVLVS CHRISTI

[2] The earliest letters (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 438-444, *Epp.* 43-51) belong to October 13 or 15: the Pope's anniversary brought to Rome every year, for September 29, a certain number of bishops.

done, and requests the gathering in Italy of another Council, in which shall be repaired the unjust acts of that of Ephesus. Some months later, the Imperial Court of the West being transferred to Rome, the Pope induced it to take a part in this matter. Valentinian III., his mother Placidia, and his wife Eudoxia wrote[1] to the princes of Constantinople, their kinsfolk, in support of the representations of the Roman Pontiff.

It was labour in vain. An imperial law had just been issued by Theodosius II.,[2] approving of everything that the assembly at Ephesus had done, and giving to its decisions the requisite sanctions. To the Pope[3] and to the princes of Ravenna the reply was made that everything had passed off well at the Council, that Flavian and other causes of disturbance having been removed, religious peace was re-established throughout the whole Empire of the East, without any damage to the Faith.[4]

Order did indeed reign. The police had exerted themselves to see that the deposed bishops were removed from their churches. Flavian found a place of exile assigned to him. A eunuch named Saturninus was conducting him to it when the poor bishop, overwhelmed no doubt by strain and ill-treatment, died in the hands of the men who were escorting him.[5] The wretched Domnus disappeared also, though in a

[1] Leo, *Epp.* 55-58. The sovereigns took part in the festival of St Peter's Chair (February 22). It has been thought (*Analecta Maredsolana* i., p. 409) possible to connect with this fact a sermon "in cathedra sancti Petri," transcribed in an ancient collection of Homilies at Toledo. This does not seem to me very certain.

[2] Mansi, *Conc.* vii., p. 495.

[3] The letter addressed to the Pope has not come down to us.

[4] Leo, *Epp.* 62-64.

[5] Chronicles of Prosper and of Marcellinus *ad ann.* 449. That of Prosper is contemporary: that of Marcellinus seems to reproduce annals of Constantinople which are also contemporary. On the death of Flavian the testimonies are in disagreement. At the Council of Chalcedon it was said repeatedly that he had been killed; Dioscorus was referred to as the murderer: his deacons Peter (Peter Mongus) and Harpocration and also the monk Barsumas were represented as having committed the actual assault upon Flavian (Mansi, *Conc.* vi., p. 691 A, 1017; vii., p. 68): in 453 Pope Leo, writing to Theodoret (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 496; Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, liv., p. 1051), says that Dioscorus *in sanguine innocentis et catholici sacerdotis . . . manus intinxit.* Flavian, however, says nothing resembling this in his

less tragic fashion. He had formerly been a monk in the monastery of St Euthymius on the outskirts of Jerusalem : it was from thence that he had set out to join his Uncle John and to make his fortune. He entered this pious retreat once more, no doubt with regret at having left it. He was replaced by a certain Maximus, probably the deacon who in the days of the Patriarch John had offered him so much opposition.[1] Ibas, who had already been some time a prisoner, was provided with a successor. The same was the case with Eusebius of Dorylæum. Theodoret was requested to retire to a monastery which he possessed near Apamea. He too would no doubt have been replaced; but they had not time to do it.

The see of Constantinople was vacant. One of Dioscorus' men was chosen to fill it[2]—Anatolius, an Alexandrian *apocrisiarius* who was resident at the capital. Such a choice was not likely to please the supporters of Flavian. However, an effort was made to secure authorization for him from Pope Leo,

letter of appeal : *Statim me circumvallat multitudo militaris et volente me ad sanctum altare confugere non concessit, sed nitebatur de ecclesia eruere. Tunc tumultu plurimo facto vix potui ad quendam locum ecclesiae confugere et ibi cum his qui mecum erant latere, non tamen sine custodia ne valeam universa mala quae erga me commissa sunt ad vos referre.* The legate Hilary does not seem to have had knowledge of other acts of violence, for he says nothing about them in his letter to Pulcheria (Leonis, *Ep.* 46), and the Pope himself, in the letters based on the new reports made by Hilary, does not make any allusion either, not even in the letter which he addressed to Flavian. The latter's death, which happened shortly after the Council, would naturally have been attributed to the brutalities of which he had been the object, and certain details, certain complicities which had been passed over at first, would have been emphasized, with more or less exaggeration. Pope Gelasius (*Gesta de nomine Acacii* 2) says that after having been taken as an exile to Hypepe, he died there *superveniente seu ingesta morte.* According to Liberatus (*Breviarium* 12) *caesus Flavianus et multis iniuriis affectus dolore plagarum migravit ad Dominum* ; the historian Evagrius (ii. 2) accuses Dioscorus of having kicked him. We may neglect the later accounts.

[1] *Supra*, pp. 266, 277.

[2] Theodore the Reader (Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, lxxxvi., p. 217), says that Dioscorus himself conducted the consecration. It is very difficult to believe. The consecrators wrote to Pope Leo : the signature of Dioscorus would assuredly have been mentioned by the Pope in the letters which he sent to Constantinople relative to this consecration.

and in conformity with custom the new bishop and his consecrators wrote to him. Leo whose intervention in the matter of the Council had so far been set aside, seized the opportunity offered him. Neither Anatolius nor the bishops who had ordained him had sent any kind of profession of faith. The assumption was that they were living in ordinary times and that nothing serious had happened. The Pope[1] then declared that he was ready to recognize Anatolius, provided that Anatolius accepted, together with Cyril's letter to Nestorius (Καταφλυαροῦσι), that which he, Leo, himself had written to Flavian on the subject of the Incarnation. To shorten the negotiations, he sent to Constantinople a deputation composed of two bishops[2] and two Roman priests.

Leo evidently reckoned on the probability that these legates when they arrived at the Court of the East would succeed in exercising useful activity there. Providence helped him in a different fashion: the Emperor, Theodosius II., died on July 28 as the result of an accident on horseback.

He left no children. With determination the Empress Pulcheria grasped the reins of government, and without delay ordered the execution of the Grand Chamberlain, Chrysaphius. Perhaps he had endeavoured to weave some intrigue in order to maintain himself in power. In any case he was detested alike for his avarice and for the scandalous abuse which he had made of his influence over the dead Emperor.[3] However the Empress did not feel her hands strong enough to govern alone: she associated with herself a senator, Marcian, who had had a career in the army. Though neither of them[4] was any longer young she married him on condition of living as single; then she caused him to be proclaimed Emperor, and invested him herself as being the trustee of the Theodosian tradition.

The fall of Chrysaphius was a catastrophe for the party of Eutyches. Down to the death of Theodosius II. Pulcheria had had to keep to herself the expression of her private opinions,

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 452-454, July 16 and 17, 450 (*Epp.* 69-71) to Theodosius, Pulcheria, the monks of Constantinople.

[2] One of them was Abundius of Como.

[3] Chronicles of Prosper and of Marcellinus. Apart from the ecclesiastical writers we have little information about this eminent person.

[4] She was in her fifty-second year: he was fifty-eight.

which agreed with those of Archbishop Flavian and Pope Leo. Now that she was mistress everything was to change. From the outset Leo was informed that henceforward his wishes would be regarded. The victims of Dioscorus and his synod were recalled from exile; Flavian's remains, which had been brought back to Constantinople, were deposited with great pomp in the Church of the Holy Apostles; Eutyches was taken from his monastery, and found himself established in a place of confinement in the suburbs; in a word the evil that had been done was repaired so far as possible. As for the members of the assembly at Ephesus their lamentations were soon heard. A number of them declared that they had yielded to violence and began to repudiate the decisions given in their name. Anatolius, since the wind had changed, had made haste to receive the legates and to sign the letter to Flavian; he now set himself to secure signatures to it from the others. Maximus of Antioch was not less edifying; the possession of the Patriarchate had moderated his passions, hitherto so little controlled. Leo, who was kept informed of what was happening, was presiding from Rome over this movement of reparation. Day by day the number of opponents was being reduced. There remained, however, still some: Dioscorus in particular gave no sign of coming to a better mind. It might have been said that he was still cherishing the hope of a new turn of events in which he might regain his position of triumphant hero.[1] They were vain imaginings! It was to the rôle of scapegoat that circumstances were about to dedicate him. To lay the blame on the dead Emperor was a thing impossible: in those days Emperors were never wrong. All the blame then fell on the knavery of Dioscorus and the stupidity of Juvenal.[2] The care of these men and of some others the Pope meant to take upon himself: as for the rest of the prelates who had been at Ephesus, he remitted them to the Bishop of Constantinople who, in concert with the legates, would take

[1] Dioscorus seems, upon the accession of Marcian, to have had inclinations towards political opposition. He was accused (see the complaint of Sophronius at the third session of Chalcedon) of having hindered the proclamation of Marcian at Alexandria. This must be compared with the rumour which reached Nestorius and which is dealt with below, p. 311.

[2] In qua (*synodo*) malevolentiam suam Dioscorus, imperitiam autem Juvenalis ostendit (*Leonis Ep.* lxxxvi. 1).

steps to rehabilitate them after exacting from them suitable amends.

Already it seemed to him that everything was in a position to be settled, without the turmoil of a council, by the mere acceptance of his letter. What good was to be served by further inconveniencing the bishops? Those of the West especially, who were more disturbed about Attila than about Eutyches, had every possible reason for staying at home. So thought the Pope. At Constantinople, on the other hand, great importance was attached to the meeting of the council. The Government desired that there should be elucidated once and for all this question of the Incarnation which was so prolific in controversies, and that agreement should be arrived at on a formula resting upon high authority. For the defeat of Dioscorus and the powerful party which grouped itself behind him, the procedure by way of securing signatures seemed rather an ineffective course: it was thought not to be going beyond what was necessary that the episcopate in its entirety should be brought into line. For these and certain other reasons it was decided that a council should be held at Nicæa, and that as many bishops should be summoned as it should be possible to collect.

Pope Leo, though little allured by this solution, was none the less obliged to fall in with it. For his first legates he had already substituted others—the Bishop Lucentius[1] and the priest Basil: he joined to them in addition Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybæum in Sicily (Marsala), and Boniface, a priest of Rome. Paschasinus was expressly entrusted with the duty of presiding at the Council in the name of the Pope: the others were to assist him. Leo added to them in addition Julian, the Bishop of Cos, an Italian by birth, who had lived for a long time at Rome and possessed a thorough knowledge of the two languages.

Flocking to Nicæa were to be seen more than 520 bishops, all belonging to the Eastern Empire except the Roman legates and two from Africa. Besides these there was the usual crowd of monks who had come, without summons, from Constantinople and from Syria. Dioscorus arrived from Egypt with seventeen of his own bishops. He was in no sense beaten. The Emperor had promised to be present at the Council, but he kept them

[1] Of Ascoli in Picenum.

waiting for a very considerable time. The monks were in a state of ferment, and Dioscorus who, apart from his own Egyptians still had the support of a large number of bishops of Palestine and Illyricum, had the daring to risk a stroke of supreme audacity. He pronounced, on his own authority, excommunication against Pope Leo.[1] He wished, no doubt, as his predecessors Theophilus and Cyril had done, to reverse the parts and to put into the position of a person accused, even of one condemned, the man who was setting up to be his judge. But he had presumed too much upon his powers. Contrary to his expectation he was not followed: only about ten of the Egyptian bishops gave their signature: the rest abstained.

The legates had remained at Constantinople; they were waiting for the Emperor. The latter, detained by military necessities, was still unable to find leisure to go to Nicæa. On the other hand he had no intention that the capital should be the theatre of these great religious sessions which might cause disturbance in the populace. He began by expelling the monks and then requested the bishops to transfer themselves to Chalcedon where the Emperor would have every facility for attending.[2]

The Council opened on October 8, 451, in the Basilica

[1] I place this event at this point (1) because it is certain that it took place at Nicæa and there is no sign that Dioscorus had any other occasion for finding himself in this town; (2) because while earlier than the Council of Chalcedon, it seems clearly to have been subsequent to the pontifical letters which preceded that assembly. Leo makes no mention of it anywhere before the Council, not even in his instructions to Paschasinus. As for the ground of the condemnation I think that Dioscorus based it on the doctrine of the Tome of Leo, a doctrine in which his supporters always pretended to find a new expression of the Nestorian heresy.

[2] On the Council of Chalcedon our information is derived from the formal records of this assembly and the documents annexed. No use can be made of the panegyric of Macarius of Tkôou (Anteopolis), supposed to have been pronounced at Gangra by Dioscorus in exile. M. E. Revillout has published a portion of this production in his *Revue égyptologique* (vol. i., p. 187; ii., p. 21; iii., p. 17) under the title "Récits de Dioscore exilé à Gangres sur le concile de Chalcédoine"), attributing to it great importance. M. Amelineau, who has given it complete in his *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Egypte chrétienne* (vol. iv. of the *Mémoires* of the French Archæological Mission at Cairo [1888], p. 92), has shown (*ibid.* pp. xv. ff.) that it is an apocryphal document and of no value.

of St Euphemia, a magnificent building, a sanctuary associated with miracles.[1] The Emperor was not present at the opening, but his place was taken by an impressive group of high functionaries,[2] headed by the Patrician Anatolius. These personages, nineteen in number, took their place in front of the balustrade which closed the apse. Seats had been prepared right and left along the whole length of the nave. On the left of the officials sat the Roman legates, Anatolius of Constantinople, Maximus the Patriarch of Antioch, Thalassius and Stephen, the Bishops of Cæsarea in Cappadocia and of Ephesus, with those under their jurisdiction, that is, the Bishops of Thrace, Asia Minor, and Syria. In front, to the right of the official body, were Dioscorus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, and the representative of Anastasius, the Bishop of Thessalonica. These too had their suffragans with them, that is, the Bishops of Egypt, of Palestine, and of Illyricum. The mode of seating answered to the views held: on the right were the supporters of Dioscorus and of his Council, on the left their opponents.

When the session had opened the legates demanded that, without other discussion, Dioscorus should be excluded from the assembly: such was the purport of their instructions. The presidents had some difficulty in making them understand that a formal trial was necessary. It was proceeded to

[1] Description in Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 3. It included an atrium, a covered basilica and a round sanctuary, with two stages one above the other, in the midst of which was the silver shrine with the relics of the martyr. The latter, at some uncertain date, warned in a dream either the Bishop of Chalcedon or some other pious person to come to gather the "Vintage" at her tomb. Accordingly the Emperor, the Court, the Patriarch, and the clergy of the capital went in state to the basilica. The Patriarch opened a little window pierced in the tomb and passed through it an iron rod fitted with a sponge. It was drawn out soaked with a red liquid which passed for the blood of the martyr. This marvel is not without analogy with those still to be seen at Naples and at Bari.

[2] The protocols make a constant distinction between the *Judices* and the *Senatores*: the first are actual holders of office—Anatolius, *Magister militum* and Patrician; Palladius, Prætorian Prefect of the Orient; Tatian, Prefect of Constantinople; Vincomalus, Master of the Offices, with an ex-Master, Martial; Sporacius, *Comes Domesticorum;* Genethlius, Count of the Privy Treasury. As for the senators, to the number of twelve, they were all former officials of the highest rank, Consuls, Patricians, Prætorian Prefects, Grand Chamberlains.

without delay. Dioscorus took a seat in the middle of the church as the accused, and immediately Eusebius of Dorylæum[1] stood up with an act of accusation formally drawn up. He also took a place in the middle as accuser. His application urged the reading to the Council of the Acts of the assembly at Ephesus, from which he proposed to prove that Dioscorus as judge had acted contrary to the Faith and to justice.

The reading began, but was broken by various incidents. At the first mention of the name of Theodoret, the presidents interrupted to say that this bishop ought to be brought in, that Pope Leo had restored him, and that the Emperor had so decided. There was a fine disturbance. However, Theodoret made his entrance, amid acclamations from the left and outcries from the right: "Out with the master of Nestorius, the enemy of God, the Jew!" "To the doors with Dioscorus, the assassin!" "To the doors with the enemies of Flavian, the Manichæans!" "To receive Theodoret is to condemn Cyril!" Recalled to order by the magistrates, the bishops calmed themselves for a moment, and Theodoret, ready for conciliation, took his seat on the bench of the accusers.

When they came to the proceedings at Ephesus, to the evasion of the letters of Pope Leo, the rehabilitation of Eutyches, the condemnation of Flavian and of Eusebius, disapprobation became more and more evident. On the benches to the left were seated in considerable numbers members of the Council of Ephesus, and those not the least important among them—Thalassius of Cæsarea, Stephen of Ephesus, Basil of Seleucia. Covered now with shame they excused themselves abjectly, sought for evasions, and not being able to implicate the Emperor Theodosius II., fell back upon the terror which had been inspired in them by the terrible Patriarch of Alexandria. The latter, who felt himself to be lost and had no longer any shift to try, gazed upon them with sneering glances, and let fly at them from time to time a bitter interruption: "What! Do you dare to deny it? Say at once that you were not there." The

[1] In these proceedings Eusebius always takes the part of accuser. Every time that he appears he has in his wallet a plaint drawn up against someone. It was a rôle useful, perhaps, but ungrateful. His personal inclination must here have been at the service of his zeal.

Egyptians acted as a chorus: "Ah! You were afraid. Is a Christian afraid? Fine martyrs you would make!"

But it was not by sarcasms that Dioscorus could improve his position. In the formal records of Ephesus were included the Acts of Flavian's Council. When the place was reached where the Bishop of Constantinople had explained how in agreement with Cyril (the official Cyril) he understood the doctrine in dispute, the presidents requested the bishops to say what they thought of these explanations. Beginning with the legate Paschasinus, the prelates of the highest rank hastened to declare them orthodox. Juvenal, seeing that the wind had turned without hope of change, rose and declared that he, he too, was of this opinion; and then in order the better to establish his position, he crossed over from the right to the left, followed by all the bishops of Palestine. Those of Illyricum did the same, with the exception of Atticus, the metropolitan of Nicopolis, who pretended to be unwell and vanished. But the crowning point was that four Egyptian bishops, there, under the eye of their Pope, separated themselves from him and proceeded to join his opponents.

At last the end was reached of the interminable protocols of Ephesus and Constantinople. As the reading proceeded the assembly had manifested in a very adequate manner that it regarded as shameful iniquities both the rehabilitation of Eutyches and the condemnation of Flavian. The occasion had now arrived for confirming this judgement by pronouncing the deprivation of the guilty. But the session had been prolonged till nightfall. It was by the light of candles that the officials who presided deferred the continuation of the deliberations to an ensuing session, adding as they did so that in their opinion it would be expedient to depose Dioscorus, Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basil of Seleucia, who were more particularly responsible for the perfidy at Ephesus. The assembly separated to the chant of the Trisagion, "Holy God, Holy and Mighty, Holy and Immortal, have mercy upon us!"[1]

Two days later,[2] on October 10, the Council met for the

[1] It is the first time that mention is made of this famous acclamation.

[2] Evagrius transposes Session II. and III. of the Council: the order which he follows is that of the most ancient Latin version. Facundus

second time. Dioscorus was not present at the session. The same was the case with Juvenal and the four others[1] whose deprivation had been demanded by the magistrates. The latter called attention to the counsel which they had given for their deposition, and presented a request, in the name of the Emperor, for the promulgation of a Definition of Faith. The Council had little desire for one. It thought that, as the affair of Eutyches had been settled by the Pope, all that was needed was to confine themselves to the documents that had been previously authorized and upon which they were in agreement. These were read: the Creed of Nicæa, then the creed called the Creed of Constantinople which here makes its first appearance under this title, then the two classic letters of Cyril to Nestorius and to John of Antioch, and finally the Tome of Leo to Flavian, to which the Pope had added in the previous year a collection of testimonies from the Fathers. As he fully recognized that in the East Cyril enjoyed a very high authority the Pope had not failed to have recourse to his works: three passages from his *Scholia on the Incarnation* appear in the series of extracts. This did not hinder him from censuring[2] the famous formula, "One is the Nature incarnate of the God Word," to which the Cyrillians clung so much. In fine, both Pope Leo and the Government[3] and the Council, as a whole, were in agreement in passing over in silence the Cyril of the Anathemas, compromised for the

also (*Def.* v. 3) attests the fact that some MSS. placed Session III. before Session II. This discrepancy comes, I think, from the fact that Session III. which was held apart from the magistrates, must have been wanting in certain official copies, and that when it was supplied later it was placed in a different order.

[1] However, the name of Eustathius of Berytus appears in the list of those present at the second session: it does so no doubt by mistake.

[2] Letter to Paschasinus (*Ep.* 88: Jaffé, *Regesta*, 468): "Scias penitus detestandos qui secundum Eutychis impietatem atque dementiam in Domino . . . dicere ausi sunt duas non esse naturas, hoc est perfectae divinitatis atque perfectae humanitatis; et putant quod possent nostram diligentiam fallere, cum aiunt se unam Verbi naturam credere incarnatam."

[3] However, the officials got themselves into trouble sometimes among these *dossiers:* thus, at the end of the first session of the Council the lay bureau presented the two letters of Cyril as having both been ratified by the first Council of Ephesus. It was a *lapsus*: the reference is clearly to the two letters which were read at the following session and of which one only was read at the Council of Ephesus, the second being subsequent to it in date.

time being by the abuse made of them by Eutyches. This omission was not, however, to the taste of everyone. Some bishops were unable to grasp the agreement, officially admitted, between Leo and Cyril. It was necessary to give some explanations on that head to the Palestinians and to the "Illyrians." One of the latter, Atticus of Nicopolis, who had recovered from the timely indisposition with which he had been seized at the first session, was moved to remark that besides the two letters of Cyril which had just been read there was yet another which it would have been worth while to mention, that in which figure the twelve Anathemas. They appeared not to hear him. Anatolius was commissioned to collect the bishops at his quarters in order to give the explanations which might be still necessary and to give his attention to the question of faith. It was decided to suspend the sessions for five days. However, three days later (October 13) a new meeting was held, this time to deal with the case of Dioscorus. At the end of the previous session some voices had been raised, begging for mercy for the proscribed bishops in general and even for him; but no heed had been paid to them. Eusebius of Dorylæum, resuming his rôle of accuser, laid a complaint relative to the Council of 449. Four clergy of Alexandria laid others in regard to abuses committed by their bishop in his episcopal administration. Nothing of all this was discussed, for they failed entirely in citing Dioscorus at his dwelling. He put forward excuse after excuse, and finally stayed at home. It was necessary to proceed *per contumaciam*. On this day the imperial officers had not come to the Council: it was the Roman legates who directed the discussions. Their leader, Paschasinus, rose and pronounced the sentence. After reference first to the usurpation of power whereby, even before the Council of Ephesus, Dioscorus had restored Eutyches, and then to the insult done to Pope Leo by the refusal to read his letters, he declared that strictly speaking they might have dealt mercifully with him as Pope Leo had desired should be done with the other members of the assembly at Ephesus, who had returned to a better mind.[1] But Dioscorus, so far from

[1] There is no express mention of the deposition of Flavian. The legates seem to have wished to confine themselves, so far as possible, to acts in which the responsibility of Dioscorus was alone involved, thus passing the sponge over the collective misdeeds committed at Ephesus.

repenting, had outraged the Holy See afresh by pronouncing excommunication against the Pope and had insulted the Council itself by refusing to answer the grave accusations laid against him. "In consequence the most holy and blessed Archbishop of the great and old Rome, Leo, by us and by this holy Council, in union with the blessed Apostle Peter who is the corner-stone of the Catholic Church and the foundation of the orthodox faith, has deprived him of the episcopal office and of all sacerdotal dignity."

One after another the bishops expressed themselves in conformity with this decree and appended their signatures. The sentence was communicated to the condemned: the Council also notified the Sovereigns, the clergy of Alexandria who had to administer the vacancy, and finally, some days later, the populace of Constantinople and of Chalcedon, among whom Dioscorus was beginning to spread the report that all was not finished and that he was going to have his revenge.

At the fourth session, which took place on October 17, the magistrates made a further attempt to obtain a Definition of Faith. Not succeeding in this, they moved the bishops to declare expressly and individually whether they accepted the Tome of Leo. One after another they accepted it. This done, they demanded the return of the five accomplices of Dioscorus. The magistrates, with much dissatisfaction, sent to consult the Emperor who referred the matter to the Council. The latter, which in the previous session had deliberately isolated Dioscorus from the group of those accused with him, hastened to admit them, after having assured themselves that they had adhered to the Tome of Leo and to the deposition of the Patriarch of Alexandria.

Now came the turn of the Egyptian bishops. They had not been seen again since the first session. Reduced to thirteen by the defections of October 8, they presented a profession of faith in which they declared themselves faithful to the teaching of their former bishops, from St Mark to Cyril, and hostile to all heretics, from Simon to Nestorius. However, they made no mention of Eutyches nor even of Apollinaris, and spoke neither of the Tome nor of Dioscorus. When an effort was made to induce them to explain themselves, all that was obtained was lamentations and cries for pity: they could do nothing without their head, the Bishop of Alexandria.

However, the Council succeeded in making them condemn Eutyches. As for signing the letter of Leo, as for approving the deposition of Dioscorus, for them it meant exposing themselves to certain death, should they return to Egypt.[1] They grovelled upon the ground, begging for mercy. The Council decided that they might wait for the election of the future Patriarch before giving their signatures; but that, until then, they must remain at Constantinople under guarantees.

But the opposition was not done with; there remained still the monks who were disciples or partisans of Eutyches. After the overthrow of their leader the archbishopric of Constantinople began to interfere with them: they laid complaints before the Emperor. The latter, after having promised to deal with the matter himself, finally referred the petitioners to the Council. They presented themselves there. In order to enlighten his colleagues as to the authority of these individuals, the Patriarch of Constantinople had secured the presence of some heads of monasteries of recognized position, who were commissioned to identify the appellants. It was found that several of them were unknown persons and that the rest for the most part were hermits and not superiors of organized communities: three only out of the eighteen could claim this position. It was not then a deputation of a very influential kind. But they were not therefore the less arrogant. With them had come the notorious Barsumas. When he was noticed he was assailed with outcries: "Out with the assassin! To the amphitheatre with the homicide! Exile him!" When calm was restored, Carosus, the spokesman, presented a petition by which the monks demanded neither more nor less than the restoration of Dioscorus, declaring that if they were refused satisfaction they would create a schism, not wishing to remain with people who were violating the Creed of Nicæa.

This insolent manifesto met with the reception which may be imagined. When calm was restored, Aetius, the archdeacon of Constantinople, produced the canons of Antioch against rebellious and seditious clergy, and then those who had appeared were summoned to condemn Eutyches and to accept the Tome of Leo. They refused. The bishops, the

[1] The Monophysite party here inaugurates the attitude which it was thenceforward to adopt: that of censuring Eutyches and protesting against the deposition of Dioscorus, the Tome of Leo, and the Council of Chalcedon.

officials, urged them again and again. It was useless. Firm in obstinacy, they fastened themselves to the Creed of Nicæa and would know nothing beyond it, except reprobation of Nestorius. They were offered a delay of three days. "What use is it?" they replied. "We are here; put an end to us without further delay." Sentence, however, was deferred.[1] This matter belonged rather to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Constantinople.

With all these questions of individuals time was passing. But it was absolutely necessary to come to the Definition, so much desired by the Government. Meetings had been held at the quarters of the Patriarch of Constantinople: a formula of faith had been prepared. At the opening of the fifth session (October 22) it was read. The majority applauded, but from a group of Eastern bishops a protest was raised, and the legates supported them. We no longer possess this draft decree: it was not inserted in the formal record. It was objected to it that it was not sufficiently in agreement with the letter of Pope Leo. Doubtless it did not contain the expression *in two natures*, to which the Pope attached so much importance. The disagreement appeared so grave to the legates and the situation so much strained that they asked the magistrates to give them their passports in order to return to Italy, whither the Council should be transferred. The magistrates proposed the modification of the form of statement and the nomination for this purpose of a commission which was to meet in the sanctuary of St Euphemia, adjoining the church. Dioscorus, they said to the bishops, is in favour of the formula "*of* two natures": he has been condemned. Not for his doctrine, replied Anatolius, but only for having excommunicated the Pope and refused to obey the Council. The assembly became a scene of tumult. There were cries of "Down with the Nestorians!" meaning by that the bishops of the East. It was protested that Leo was in agreement

[1] After the Fourth Session the original Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, in the form in which we have them in the ordinary Greek text, give another account of this business, purporting to have been dealt with in a session on October 20. At the end it is determined that the monks shall have a month's delay, from October 15 to November 15. This document which is lacking in the ancient Latin versions and which was unknown to Evagrius, seems to me to be a doublet of the Fourth Session so far as concerns the episode of the monks.

with Cyril; that they ought to hold to the text that had been proposed.[1] The magistrates, in perplexity, sent to Constantinople, asking for instructions. The messenger returned with a decision of the Emperor, in conformity with their proposal and to the wishes of the legates: either a new commission or the transfer of the Council to the West. The outcries began again: "If they won't have our plan, let us go. The other side are Nestorians! Let them go to Rome!" The "Illyrians," though they were suffragans of the Pope, cried out more loudly than the others. "This must be ended," said the magistrates. "Are you for Leo or for Dioscorus?"[2] "For Leo," replied the assembly. The commission was immediately set up. This time all the three legates were on it, together with six Easterns. The other party was largely represented: Thalassius, Eusebius of Ancyra, former members of the Council of Dioscorus, appeared in it, together with Atticus of Nicopolis and various others of the same side. The delegates shut themselves up in the mausoleum (*martyrium*) of St Euphemia and deliberated in secret.[3] When they returned they had drawn up the Definition of Faith of the Council of Chalcedon. It was at once read. The passage of primary importance is the following: "We believe . . . in Jesus Christ . . . who for us and our salvation came forth from the Virgin Mary, Mother of God in relation to the humanity, as one single and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, in two natures, without confusion or change, without division or separation, the difference of the natures being in no wise suppressed by their union, each nature preserving on the contrary its particularity, both concurring to form a single person and a single hypostasis. . . ."

Acclamations made themselves heard: the solution had been found at last: it had not been without difficulty.

It remained to promulgate it solemnly. Three days later, on October 25, the Emperor Marcian crossed the Bosphorus and presented himself at the Council in impressive magnificence.

[1] Eusebius of Dorylæum himself (Mansi, *Conc.* vii., p. 104) spoke in this sense.

[2] An adroit way of stating the question, but imperfect. It was between Leo and Cyril that they had to choose.

[3] No formal record, no document of any kind whatever of these deliberations, has come down to us.

He addressed them in Latin[1] and then in Greek: the text of the Definition was read once more, with the signatures of the bishops: for several provinces, at any rate, the metropolitans voted in the name of those who were absent, so that we find not less than 600 names of bishops at the end of this celebrated document.

This imperial session, to which the greatest publicity[2] was immediately given, remained for contemporaries the essential moment of the Council of Chalcedon.

To tell the truth it corresponded to a twofold capitulation of the assembly, before the Government and before the Pope. The Council did not want a Definition: one was extorted from it. At the very least it wished for one which was not fixed or precise: "A single Person resulting from the union of two natures." It had been constrained into accepting the Roman formula, "A single Person in two natures." It was almost the same position as at Nicæa. Eutyches had been condemned without difficulty as Arius had been at Nicæa. As at Nicæa too, an effort had been made to contrive for the vanquished party a shelter of orthodox appearance under which it might be able to prolong its existence. With this end in view they had entrenched themselves behind a terminology borrowed from Cyril, which was a strong recommendation. The legates pressed their point and secured the adoption of clear terms. The mischief is that they had against them the general sentiment which was in favour of ambiguity, and that only the old-fashioned "Easterns," the Nestorians, as they were currently styled, supported them with enthusiasm.

This alliance made itself clearer still in the following sessions when the business was dealt with of those who had been condemned at Ephesus. The Bishop of Antioch, Domnus,[3] had not appealed against his deposition; in his stead Maximus

[1] Latin was still the official language even in the Eastern Empire. In the Councils the letters of the Pope, even these, were read in Latin first, then in Greek.

[2] It is in this connexion that there was formed and put in circulation in the West a *dossier* which has been preserved to us in *Codex Vaticanus* 1322, which has been very well described by the Ballerini in their edition of St Leo, vol. ii., p. 727; *cf.* Maassen, *Quellen*, i. 737. This *dossier* has been included almost in its entirety in the Collection of Quesnel. The last document, in order of time, is a letter of Leo, of March 21, 453.

[3] Mansi, *Conc.* vii., p. 269.

had been selected at Constantinople and had been ordained by Anatolius about the beginning of the year 451. Pope Leo, albeit this interference of Constantinople in the affairs of Antioch was little pleasing to him, had refrained from rejection of this arrangement. The only question concerning Domnus then was to provide that a pension should be allowed him by his successor. But Theodoret and Ibas were demanding their bishoprics again. Theodoret's had already been given back to him by Pope Leo: he wished that this settlement should be ratified by the Council, and this did not go through without objections.[1] It was demanded of him with insistence and in discourteous terms that he should condemn Nestorius He made up his mind to do so: "Anathema to Nestorius and to him who does not give to Mary the title of Mother of God or who divides Christ into two Sons." Theodoret was well aware that Nestorius did not censure absolutely the term "Mother of God" and that he had never taught the "two Sons." His anathema carries with it, I think, a certain admixture of irony.

The affair of Ibas[2] encountered more difficulty. Acquitted at Tyre, he had been deposed at Ephesus. The proceedings at Tyre were read, but the legates opposed the reading of those at Ephesus: the accursed synod was no longer to count. It was abolished: the Emperor was entreated to issue a law upon the subject. There was also read a document of a very delicate character—the letter of Ibas to Maris the Persian in which unfavourable language was used of Cyril. The legates, however, decided that Ibas was orthodox[3]: he was restored, not without having pronounced the anathema against Nestorius. This was also required from certain prelates who were suspected of retaining feelings of sympathy for the former Bishop of Constantinople.[4]

Thus the Eastern term "Two Natures," which so strongly repelled Cyril, was not merely tolerated or accepted but imposed as a rule of faith: the former friends of Nestorius, notably Theodoret and Ibas, who had figured in the front rank of the opponents of Cyril, were received, rehabilitated, restored in the

[1] Acta viii. [2] Acta ix. and x.

[3] *Αναγνωσθείσης γὰρ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς αὐτοῦ, ἐπέγνωμεν αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν ὀρθόδοξον* (Mansi, *Conc.* vii., p. 261).

[4] Mansi, vii., 192, 193.

sees from which they had been driven by the sentences of Dioscorus and the police of Theodosius II. "What could be clearer," concluded the Monophysites. "Nestorius had his revenge. The bishops at Chalcedon and their instigator, Pope Leo, were so many Nestorians. What a comedy! They were anathematizing Nestorius and canonizing his doctrine."

This way of looking at things soon became for the Monophysites an article of faith, and this had very serious consequences. What is more curious still is the fact—a fact which we have only just learnt—that such was the view of Nestorius himself.

Nestorius was still in this world. For long years he had lived in wretchedness, but in peace, in his distant oasis. One day[1] it was completely raided by the Nobades, a barbarous horde established on the upper Nile, to the south of the First Cataract. The Nobades put everything to fire and sword and carried away a multitude of prisoners, among them the exiled bishop. Then, learning that other barbarians, the Maziques, were about to descend on the oasis and put themselves on their tracks, they thought it advisable to rid themselves of their prisoners, entrusted them to Nestorius, and compelled them to set out for the valley of the Nile. On the way the caravan broke up, each going where he chose. One party only of the fugitives arrived, with Nestorius at their head, at the town of Panopolis (Achmin).[2] It was, for the man who had been condemned at Ephesus, a dangerous place of sojourn. Schnoudi[3] was not far from these: the frosts of age had in no wise extinguished his energy and especially his zeal against heretics. Nestorius wrote to the governor of the Thebaid to point out that if he had contravened his sentence of banishment he had been compelled to do so by *force majeure*. He asked also not to be delivered over to the hands of those who wished him ill, lest it should be said that it was better to be a captive among barbarians than to live under the protection of Rome. But the implacable Schnoudi had his eye upon him; besides, failing him, Dioscorus and Chrysaphius sufficed to keep the

[1] With regard to this, see the two letters of Nestorius preserved by Evagrius, *H. E.* i. 7.

[2] According to Timothy Aelurus (*Plerop.* 36) he had been sold by the barbarians to the town of Panopolis.

[3] Vol. II., p. 398 f.

officials of Theodosius II. in the paths of severity. Nestorius was despatched to Elephantine, on the farthest frontier. He had hardly arrived there when a counter-order recalled him to Panopolis. He re-entered it half dead, broken with fatigue, with one arm and his sides injured by accidents of the journey: he did so to hear assigned to himself a third place of exile, and that was not the last, for he was still to be transferred once again.

It was doubtless in this fourth retreat, in the desert behind Panopolis, that he wrote the last pages of his *Apology*.[1] Time was moving on, events were being precipitated, and the echo of them reached even to his mournful solitude. Nestorius heard of the controversy of Eutyches and Flavian, of the triumph of Dioscorus at the second Council of Ephesus, the death of Flavian, the intervention of Pope Leo, and the sudden change of things on the death of Theodosius II. The last fact that he has mentioned in his *Memoirs* is a local fact, the flight of Dioscorus to escape deposition and exile. This relates to some rumour, or to some episode otherwise unknown but prior to the Council of Chalcedon. Of that Nestorius does not speak. It is possible that he had knowledge of it before his death, but his pen stops a little earlier.

He was resigned, perceiving well that he would never return from his exile: "My dearest desire," he said, "is that God should be blessed in heaven and upon earth. As for Nestorius, let him remain anathema! God grant that while cursing me men may reconcile themselves with Him. . . . I should not refuse to withdraw what I have said,[2] if I were certain that

[1] This work, which was known to Evagrius (*H. E.* i. 70, p. 257), has just been published in Syriac by Père Paul Bedjan (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1910) from several copies of a MS. at Kotchanes. The Abbé Nau has given a French translation of it under the title *Le livre d'Héraclide de Damas*. In Syriac the work is entitled: *The Book which is called Tegourtâ of Heracleides of Damascus, written by Mar Nestorius*. On the basis of a MS. copy Mr J. F. Bethune-Baker has produced a study entitled, *Nestorius and his Teaching* (Cambridge, 1908), in which the doctrines of Nestorius are examined with care, perhaps with too much concern for apologetic. Full extracts from the book are reproduced in it. John Philoponus, who wrote a work in four books against the Council of Chalcedon, seems to have known the Memoirs of Nestorius or at the least a study by the former Bishop of Constantinople of the relations between his doctrine and that of Flavian (Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Cod. 55).

[2] The expressions, clearly, for it is of that alone that any question can arise.

it was required of me and that men could thus be led back to God." He had seen the documents of the Councils of Constantinople (448) and Ephesus (449), and knew upon what to rely in regard to the doctrine of his successor Flavian. The Tome of Leo had filled him with joy. Flavian and Leo thought exactly as he did. He had been advised to write to Leo. If he had not done so, it was not because of an unreasonable pride, it was in order not to embarrass the Roman Pope, in order that the unpopularity attaching to himself, Nestorius, might not make an obstacle to the task which Leo was accomplishing so well.

Long live the doctrine of Flavian and of Leo! Anathema to Nestorius! It is exactly the Council of Chalcedon.

In fact, one can continue to ask oneself in what did the heresy of Nestorius consist?[1] At the outset, as we have seen, it was identified with that of Paul of Samosata, which is assuredly a stupendous blunder. Later he was reproached with teaching two Sons, two persons in Jesus Christ,[2] and this is what is currently called Nestorianism. But he did not cease to protest the contrary. Even though his predecessors, Theodore and Diodore, had gone as far as that and this theory had been for himself also a dangerous reef towards which were carrying him, unknown to himself, certain currents of thought, one could not attribute to him, without established proofs, a doctrine which had been solemnly repudiated by the Church of Antioch, and by which his contemporaries and friends, Theodoret and the rest, are assuredly unscathed. There remains his attitude on the question of the *Theotokos*. There, it cannot be denied, he showed himself imprudent and bungling. But, in the first place, what ecclesiastical authority

[1] For the Bishop of Carthage, Capreolus, he who had sent a deputy to the Council of Ephesus, the Nestorian heresy was identified with the following doctrine: "We must not say that God is born. A simple man was born of the Virgin Mary, and God has later dwelt in him." This follows from the correspondence interchanged between Capreolus and two Spanish monks (*servi Dei*), Vitalis and Constantius, in reference to the doctrines taught in the circle in which they were living (Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, liii., pp. 847 ff.). It is in the same fashion that Pope Gelasius represents things to himself, *Photini et Pauli Samosateni secutus errorem* (*Tract.* i. 1; iii. *passim*).

[2] It is already in this way that Pope Leo speaks (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 479, 499, 500, 542; *Epp.* cii. 3, cxxiii. 2, cxxiv. 2, clxv. 2).

had canonized this term? The Council of Nicæa had imposed the *Homoousios*: what council had prescribed the *Theotokos*? And then, had not Nestorius protested that he accepted it, provided that the sense of it was made clear? In the same way, in the 4th century, many people used to specify when accepting the *Homoousios* that they did not take this term in the same sense as did the Sabellians. At Ephesus Cyril produced statements deemed to be held by Nestorius and extracts from his works.[1] But, apart from the fact that Nestorius had not been enabled to explain them (for who could reproach him for his contumacy?), what heresy had been deduced from them at that time? None. Nestorius was censured in a general way, without any one declaring exactly why.[2]

Cyril accused Nestorius; but Nestorius on his side accused Cyril. When people had done with hasty and irregular proceedings, on what ground had the understanding been arrived at? On the proposed Anathemas of Cyril? It was with great difficulty that they had been saved from a condemnation. What they were in agreement upon was the formula elaborated and presented by the friends of Nestorius, a formula which he himself would have signed with both hands, and at the same time upon the condemnation of Nestorius, the reasons for which were expressed in vague terms. Already the combination was found: Jonah was thrown into the sea, but the ship continued on its course. The blessing of peace makes its demands. Another beginning was made at Chalcedon. In the interval the proposed Anathemas had been consecrated, but by the council of Dioscorus, by what is called the "Robber-synod" of Ephesus.[3]

[1] Several of them speak of Two Natures, and it was no doubt because of this term, ill understood and ill regarded at Alexandria, that they were deemed worthy of censure.

[2] It is certainly not of his sect that we ought to ask it. He has left none. The Church of Persia, which later honoured his name, is only connected with him in a very indirect manner. The partisans whom he may have had for some time at Constantinople do not attract mention for very long. Those whom people called Nestorians at the Council of Chalcedon and on the morrow of that assembly were Theodoret and other Easterns, persons of established orthodoxy.

[3] *Latrocinium Ephesinum.* The *mot* is Pope Leo's (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 475; *Leonis Ep.* xcv.).

I do not mean to say that in this way justice has been done to Cyril. His celebrated "Chapters" admitted of other adhesions besides those of Dioscorus and of Juvenal: they obtained them later. For the moment they remained in the discreet twilight in which people shelter controversial documents.

Nor again do I mean to say that the reproaches levelled at Nestorius, from the time of his accession to the Patriarchal See of Constantinople, were devoid of foundation. It is certain that he scandalized many people whom other modes of speech would have avoided shocking. At the end of his life he deemed that Flavian and Leo had taught the same doctrine as himself. There was perhaps in this a certain element of illusion pardonable in a man proscribed, who on the day when the avenger arrived made no attempt to delude him by niceties of phrase. In the pact of union which he signed in 433, John of Antioch did not intend to tax Nestorius with heresy; but he consented, and so did his party with him, to condemn his excesses of language.[1]

It is, I think, to this official and authoritative document that we must attach importance.

Whilst preparations were being made for the great council which was, in his view, to give him a startling revenge, Nestorius, occupied with the thought of his approaching end, was entrusting himself to the Lord's hands and making his farewell to the earth which was so sombre around him: "Rejoice with me, O Desert, my friend, my support, my dwelling: thou too, land of exile, my mother,[2] who wilt guard my body until the resurrection." So ends his book.

His health visibly declined. They took pity on him: he was brought back to Panopolis and established in the fortress, but with a prohibition to discourse. One of his friends of other days, Dorotheus of Marcianopolis,[3] had come to rejoin him. However, at Constantinople they were remembered. The Emperor Marcian having been entreated to intervene, sent a tribune with letters of grace intended to put an end to the effects of the sentences of exile, and to put the two bishops out of the reach of insults.[4] It was too late, at any

[1] *Supra*, p. 264. [2] The word "exile" is in Greek (ἐξορία) feminine.
[3] *Supra*, pp. 234, 258.
[4] Nestorius had been, in 431, the object of an ecclesiastical sentence,

rate for Nestorius. The tribune found him at his last hour. It was in vain that recourse was had to physicians of the highest reputation: the exile died in his exile.[1] Dorotheus rendered him the last duties.

His friends at Constantinople demanded that his remains should be carried back thither: they even made in this connexion a noisy demonstration, all the more inopportune because the Council of Chalcedon had just at that very moment condemned anew Nestorius and his doctrine. The Emperor had them dispersed.

Schnoudi, too, died about the same time as Nestorius whose adversary and persecutor he had been (July 1, 451).[2]

irregular at the outset but subsequently ratified sufficiently to be able to be considered as definitive. No one ever spoke of going back upon this condemnation. But he had been besides exiled, in 435, by imperial decree: it is, I think, this sentence of exile which was revoked, to some extent, by the clemency of Marcian. Timothy Aelurus says only that the tribune announced to the two bishops "that they had no longer anything to fear from their adversaries."

[1] The Monophysites maintained that Nestorius had died like Arius (Vol. II., p. 146, note 2); they glutted themselves upon the details of his agony. Timothy Aelurus (*Pleroph.* 36), who wished him no good, confines himself to saying: "Dorotheus advised the tribune to wait a little (in order to communicate to him the orders of the Emperor) on account of the weakness of Nestorius; but his condition grew worse from day to day; his tongue refused its service and protruded from his mouth in the tribune's presence: his speech became indistinct: his tongue mortified to such an extent that he became an object of horror and of pity, as the tribune later on told a number of persons." Zacharias the Rhetor (III. 1) has already fuller knowledge in regard to it: the story went on, naturally, gathering details of a more and more terrifying character.

[2] According to the calculations of M. Amelineau (*Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique du Caire*, vol. iv[1]., pp. lxxxi.-lxxxix. and xciii.).

CHAPTER XII

THE MONOPHYSITES

THE Council of Chalcedon[1] had renewed the condemnations previously passed against Nestorius and Eutyches: in this it had proceeded unfettered and had shown itself unanimous. It had further enacted a Definition of dogma; but it must clearly be recognized that this had rather been snatched from it, and that it corresponded only imperfectly with the convictions of the majority. How did this situation arise? Was the

[1] For the history of the period comprised between the Council of Chalcedon and the death of Zeno, the account which comes nearest the time of the events is that of the Rhetor Zacharias of Gaza, written from the Monophysite point of view, although its author, who subsequently became Bishop of Mitylene, ended by attaching himself to the side of orthodoxy. His book, which was written in Greek, was largely drawn upon by Evagrius (Books ii. and iii.) who often quotes it. It was transcribed, with cuts however, in a Syriac compilation (*Historia miscellanea*), which comes down to the year 569 and is preserved in the British Museum MS. Add. 17202. This compilation, divided into twelve books, only depends on Zacharias for Books iii.-vi. Published in Syriac by Land in the third volume of his *Anecdota Syriaca* (Leyden, 1870), it was the subject in 1899 of two editions, one in German by K. Ahrens and G. Krüger (*Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor*) in the small Teubner collection "Scriptores Syri," fasc. iii., the other, a better one, in English by Messrs Hamilton & Brooks (*The Syriac Chronicle known as that of Zachariah of Mitylene*). On these editions see the remarks of Kugener in the *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, vol. v. (1900), pp. 201, 461. An extract from this same compilation had already been published by Mai (*Script. Veteres*, vol. x., pp. 119, 361) from a Vatican MS. Zacharias had meant to compile, not a history properly so called, but a sort of memorandum for reference, for the use of an official named Eupraxios. He hardly troubles himself about what happens outside Alexandria and Palestine.

Then follows Evagrius himself, who adds much to the accounts of Zacharias. Evagrius, who was secretary of Gregory, Patriarch of Antioch (569-594), then an official at Constantinople, has left us an Ecclesiastical History in six books which extends from the first Council of Ephesus (431) to the year 594. It is a serious work and well furnished with documents.

doctrine of St Leo then not the true mean, the straight path, between the opposite ways of Nestorius and of Eutyches? Not entirely. Apart from its natural defenders, the Romans and the friends of Theodoret, everyone in the Greek empire was in agreement in finding in it sinister resemblances to that of Nestorius. In any case it was not the only possible formulation of orthodoxy: there was another, Cyril's, to which people were accustomed. But the latter had been left in the shade. No doubt Cyril had been acclaimed and even his agreement with Leo; but the letter with the Anathemas did not appear among the documents which received canonical sanction, on which the Definition of Faith declared itself based. For his formula, "one single nature incarnate," there had been substituted the mention of the Two Natures. They had not even wished by adhering to the expression ἐκ δύο φύσεων, "of two natures," to leave open a door of communication between the two theologies. In fine, Cyril, the true Cyril, had been sacrificed to Leo.

In Latin we have the *Gesta de nomine Acacii*, printed at the head of the *Tractatus* of Pope Gelasius (Thiel, pp. 510-519, §§ 1-13; it is the best edition, for there are several), evidently anterior to his pontificate, apparently about 486. It is a somewhat brief *résumé* of the events in the East, compiled with a view to explaining the causes of the deposition of Acacius.

Much more detailed is the *Breviarium* of Liberatus, a deacon of Carthage, written about 564 (Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, lxviii., p. 969) after the condemnation of the Three Chapters: the author energetically defends them.

We must cite also the histories, lost except for a few fragments, of John of Ægeum and John Diacrinomenus (Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Codd. 41, 45: *cf.* Miller, *Revue archéologique*, xxvi. (1873), pp. 282 and 401) and of Theodore the Reader (Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, lxxxvi.). Timothy Aelurus, Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria (457-77) wrote during his exile an Ecclesiastical History of which the *Plerophoriae* (*vide infra*) have preserved for us some fragments.

To these strictly historical writings are added various biographies of Peter of Iberia, Isaiah, Theodosius, Romanus, Severus, etc., emanating from the Monophysite (acephalous) circle in Palestine: I include among these the books of *Plerophoriae*, compiled about the end of the 5th century by John of Beth Rufin, successor of Peter of Iberia, and published in French by M. Nau in the *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, iii. (1898), pp. 237 ff.

It goes without saying that precedence is taken of all these narrative texts by the official documents, the letters of the Popes, Emperors, Councils: they will be found collected in the editions of the Councils, after that of Chalcedon.

The proof that this was a blunder is the history upon which we are entering, that of the resistance of the Cyrillians to the Council of Chalcedon—in other words, of the Monophysite crisis; and especially the series of efforts made in the course of two centuries by the Byzantine Government to appease religious excitement by reconciling Leo and Cyril. Under Justinian a formula was put forward which purported to settle everything: "One of the Trinity suffered in flesh"; but it came too late. The opposition, elated by its successes and irritated by persecution, refused this agreement. What it demanded thenceforward was not Cyril reconciled with Leo, but Leo sacrificed to Cyril.

We may well believe that if the legates of Rome had been able to foresee the long-drawn-out miseries that were to follow, or if they had better understood the susceptibilities of religious opinion in the circle in which they were drawing up documents, they would have given, not clearly in regard to essentials but in the details of the terminology, a larger part to the Cyrillian tradition. The Government, after having put pressure on the Pope in order to have a Council and then on the Council in order to obtain from it a formula, thought itself strong enough to impose this formula on all its subjects and to conquer the recalcitrants. Disappointments were not long in coming.

After the principal questions, the Council treated further some matters of controversy in regard to boundaries and jurisdictions. It was at this time that definitive organization was given to the Patriarchates of Jerusalem and of Constantinople.

The Council of Nicæa[1] had accorded special honours to the Bishop of Jerusalem, without, however, withdrawing him from the authority of the Metropolitan of Cæsarea. It was a homage rendered to the great memories of the Holy City and even to earlier tradition. It seems likely, in fact, that as well before the Council of Nicæa as afterwards, the Bishop of Jerusalem had had precedence over his metropolitan in episcopal assemblies held outside Palestine.[2] Eusebius gives, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, the episcopal list of Jerusalem just

[1] *Canons*, 6, 7; Vol. II., p. 120.

[2] Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 30; a Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata; see also the Councils of Ephesus and of Chalcedon.

as he does those of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. However, the Council of Diospolis (415)[1] shows clearly that, shortly before Juvenal, the ancient subordination of Jerusalem to Cæsarea was still the rule of their provincial relations. Juvenal endeavoured to change this. He proceeded, to begin with, by isolated encroachments, ordaining bishops as far as Phœnicia and Arabia: then, at the first Council of Ephesus (431), at which his metropolitan was not present, he desired to pass from fact to right, and presented documents in favour of his pretensions.[2] But Cyril put himself in the way,[3] wrote to Rome and contrived that no progress should be given to the claims of the Bishop of Jerusalem.[4] Proclus having shown subsequently inclination to admit them, Cyril maintained his opposition.[5] For some time imperial rescripts, procured by one side or the other, continued the conflict between the sees of Antioch and of Jerusalem. Finally the Emperor Marcian referred the dispute to the Council of Chalcedon. It was settled by a partition: the Patriarch of Antioch retained the two Phœnicias and Arabia. Juvenal obtained only the three Palestines, which represented a recent dismemberment of the ancient and single province of the same name.

As for the see of Constantinople, it was already seventy years since the "œcumenical" council gathered by Theodosius in that city[6] had recognized to it the second place after the see of Rome, basing its decision on the fact that Constantinople was a new Rome. The same Council had also laid down that the bishops of the "Dioceses" of Asia and of Pontus must settle among themselves the business of their respective areas. This was, so it seems, the exclusion of all interference of the Bishop of Constantinople in these two Diocesan jurisdictions. But it had not been determined where in each of them should be the

[1] *Supra*, p. 154.

[2] "Credidit se posse proficere et insolentes ausus per commentitia scripta firmare" (Leo, *Ep.* cxix.; Jaffé, *Regesta*, 495); supplication of the Easterns to the Emperor (431) in Mansi, *Conc.* iv., p. 1402.

[3] Is this really in 431, at a time when Cyril had so much need of Juvenal, and not rather after his reconciliation with John of Antioch? The letter which he wrote to Rome was addressed to Leo (*mihi . . . indicavit*, loc. cit.); if it is to Leo as Pope, this would be in 440 or 441. But it is hardly conceivable that, for such a matter, the Patriarch of Alexandria addressed himself to a person of less dignity.

[4] *Loc. cit.* [5] Cyril, *Ep.* 56. [6] Vol. II., p. 348.

superior ecclesiastical authority, nor how it should perform its functions. In the Diocese of Asia there is seen, it is true, a certain tendency to organize itself around the apostolic see of Ephesus; but the Diocese of Pontus which stretched from the Bosphorus to the Euphrates and the Taurus was not easy to centralize. Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the residence of the civil *Vicarius*, was very far from the extremities: Ancyra, which was better situated, was its rival.[1] The province of Bithynia, comprised within this jurisdiction, was near to the capital; the town of Chalcedon was, as it were, a suburb of it; those of Nicomedia and of Nicæa were also not far from it. The bishops of Asia Minor,[2] often called to Constantinople for their business with the secular administrations, offered to the bishop of the capital the elements of an almost permanent council. It was natural enough that they should carry thither their ecclesiastical disputes. Through these relations the Bishop of Constantinople found himself initiated into the affairs of these provinces, and it often happened that he was asked to concern himself in the consecrations of bishops, to direct them, to celebrate them.

The facts by repetition passed into customs, customs into traditions. This matter had not yet been expressly dealt with formally, when Anatolius brought it before the Council of Chalcedon. The decisions taken in this connexion were formulated, along with other disciplinary canons, in a session of the Council at which the Roman legates refused to be present, saying that they had not been sent for that purpose. Their purport is as follows. In the first place (Canons 9, 17)[3] disputes with metropolitans were to be brought either before the "Exarch" of the Diocese or before the Bishop of Constantinople. To the latter was recognized the right of consecrating the metropolitans

[1] Mansi, *Conc.* vii., p. 449.

[2] Towards the middle of the 5th century the Diocese of Thrace only included twenty-five to thirty bishoprics. We can understand this body of bishops appearing somewhat limited and the effort of the Patriarch of the New Rome to extend his jurisdiction in Asia Minor.

[3] Canons 9 and 17 are drawn in such a way that it might be thought that this concurrent jurisdiction was open even to the bishops of Syria, Egypt, and Illyria. In fact, however, it only extended to the three Dioceses which formed the Patriarchate of Constantinople. By the Exarch was meant the bishop who had his see in the chief town of the civil Diocese.

of the three "Dioceses" of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace; lastly there was promulgated anew the canon of the Council of 381, by which the see of the New Rome had been classed immediately after that of the Old (Can. 28).

It could hardly be said that there was in this, from the practical point of view, a great innovation. The relations defined by the Council of Chalcedon were just those which usage had introduced for two or three generations. The legates, however, raised difficulties. They caused the holding of a supplementary session and produced instructions from Pope Leo by which they had been enjoined to secure respect for "the definition of the holy Fathers and the dignity of the Pope if any, in reliance upon the importance of their towns, should endeavour to make an attack on them." They read further what they called the definition of the holy Fathers, that is the sixth canon of Nicæa, in which there is in no way any question of Constantinople, for the good reason that that town did not exist at the time of the Council, nor of the classification of the great sees, nor even of Rome except incidentally.[1] It is true that, in the Roman copy, the canon began with this phrase, foreign to the original text: "The Roman Church has always had the pre-eminence."[2] But the pre-eminence of the Roman Church was not disputed by any one—the Council laid no stress on this gloss. The legates also raised doubts as to the circumstances in which the vote had been obtained. An enquiry was held in their presence: the Bishops of Asia and of Pontus declared that they had voted freely. However the Bishop of Ancyra, Eusebius, did not show himself very enthusiastic for the new arrangement: he foresaw that the clergy of Constantinople would abuse it for purposes of gain. Of the two sees which were chiefly interested, those of Ephesus and Cæsarea, the first had just been declared vacant. Thalassius, the occupant of Cæsarea, was doubtless not very well satisfied; but he was a man of accommodating disposition: he lent no support to the resistance of the legates.[3] The latter could do nothing more than protest.

[1] Vol. II., p. 119 f.

[2] *Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum.* On the documents of this gloss see Maassen, *Quellen* i., pp. 19 ff.

[3] An obscure phrase, Mansi, *Conc.* vii., p. 452.

Pope Leo, when he received news of the Council, showed himself much offended by these arrangements. He in his turn protested with the utmost vehemence to the Emperor, the Empress, and the Patriarch Anatolius.[1] Doubtless, they had accepted his doctrinal judgements, rehabilitated Flavian, censured Eutyches, deposed Dioscorus: doubtless, they had approved his dogmatic letter and drawn up, in strict conformity with it, the formula of the Definition. This last point represented deference of a very marked kind, for the majority, who were greatly attached to Cyril, had a feeling of having sacrificed him to the Romans. However, the Pope was not satisfied: he insisted so much and so strongly that the report spread in the East that he was going to annul the Council of Chalcedon just as he had annulled that of Ephesus. It was in vain that they quoted to him the Œcumenical Council of 381; he had no knowledge of that assembly: he would know nothing of this pre-eminence of Constantinople which reduced to the third and fourth places the old traditional sees of Alexandria and of Antioch.

This zeal for the metropolises of Egypt and Syria is not without cause for astonishment at first sight. However, if we look at it more closely, we can understand why Pope Leo made such a display of it. He could not see with a favourable eye the incessant advances of the see of Constantinople. Of what blindness would he not have been the victim had he not discerned in it a great danger for the unity of the Church and the dignity of the Greek Episcopate! For the ancient conception of the Christian brotherhood presided over by the Apostolic See of Rome, they were on the way towards substituting another, that of the Church directed from the Capital by a prelate whom his position, often also his origin and tendencies of mind, placed under the immediate influence of the Court and of the Government. No doubt the Government to-day was Pulcheria: but to-morrow? And then, were they going to push further the application of this principle that the bishop of the place where the Emperor lives has the right to a sovereign jurisdiction? Transferred to Italy, this notion of ecclesiastical law tended towards nothing less than the dispossession of the See of St Peter for the benefit of the Bishop of Ravenna.

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 481-484; *Epp.* civ.-cvii.

At bottom, Leo had excellent reasons for not taking patiently this decision of the Council; but these good reasons he could not utter, and this fact compelled him to lay stress upon others which were not always very strong nor very intelligible to the Greeks. In particular they failed entirely to understand the disdain which was publicly declared for their Œcumenical Council of 381, and regarded as extremely belated a protest which came after seventy years of silence. That Constantinople should have the second place after Rome was a thing which had passed into a custom: Anatolius had sat at the Council immediately after the legates: the latter, so far from opposing this, had called the attention of the bishops to this fact, and had lamented that at Dioscorus' Council Flavian had been put in the fifth place.[1]

This quarrel made a bad impression in the East, and greatly embarrassed the Government. On the one hand the Tome of Leo was exciting enormous opposition, and they had been forced to send troops to inculcate respect for the Council of Chalcedon: on the other this same Council was censured by the Pope. They were nonplussed. Finally a sort of accommodation was arrived at. They secured from Leo a statement of express approval[2] of the Council of Chalcedon, without his desisting, however, from his protest in favour of "the canons of Nicæa." On this point they let him say his say: Anatolius continued to exercise his authority, without insisting that it should be legalized by the Pope.

This conflict did not go outside the sphere of letter-writing: the public was only interested in it in a very indirect fashion, for the reaction which it might have upon a struggle which was infinitely more serious in their eyes.

In view of the difficulty with which the Greek Episcopate had yielded, in the matter of the formulas of the Faith, to the Roman requirements, there was reason to fear the appearance of serious resistance outside. No doubt the Government was very decided[3] and the episcopate very docile;

[1] First Session (Mansi, *Conc.* vi., p. 608).

[2] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 490 (*Ep.* cxiv.); *cf.* 491-493 (*Epp.* cxv.-cxvii.), 495 (*Ep.* cxix.).

[3] An edict was posted up at Constantinople February 7, 452; another sent to the provinces March 13 (Mansi, *Conc.* vii., 476, 477); revocation of

but there were in the East men who feared neither the Government nor its councils. They were about to appear on the scene, or rather they were there already. Before the imposing assembly at Chalcedon, the rebellious monks had appeared with arrogant mien and insolent speech: it had not been possible to bend them to obedience. The Egyptian bishops had, in truth, prostrated themselves before their colleagues, but they had no more yielded than the monks. We are about to meet with them again, both the one and the other.

It was in Palestine that the monks made their most resounding disturbance. One of them, a certain Theodosius, who in past years had played a part of some importance[1] and helped to envenom the quarrel between Dioscorus and Domnus, hastened from Chalcedon immediately on the conclusion of the Council and gave the most disquieting news of it. They had condemned Eutyches, and Nestorius too; but the latter's doctrines had been canonized and Cyril found himself proscribed in the person of his successor. The Faith had been betrayed by the bishops and persecuted by the Government. Juvenal, that Juvenal of whom they had hoped so much, who had so constantly upheld Cyril and Dioscorus, Juvenal had betrayed his trust just like the others. Ought they then to receive him?

These sparks fell in a very inflammable *milieu*. The monks were very numerous in Palestine, especially in the deserts to the east of Jerusalem, towards the Jordan and the Dead Sea. In the towns there were always many of them to be found. Most frequently they were unattached monks who passed their lives in wandering from sanctuary to sanctuary or in mortifying themselves in an asceticism at once useless and ill-regulated. Occasionally they were to be seen grouped in monasteries or even in colonies of anchorites (*lauras*). The efforts of St Euthymius to introduce discipline into the solitudes had only succeeded in a very narrow circle. At Jerusalem there were known the Convent of Passarion, and upon the Mount of

the edict of Theodosius II. against Flavian and in favour of Eutyches, July 6 (*ibid.*, p. 497); edict against the supporters of Eutyches, especially those of his monastery, July 28 (*ibid.*, p. 501).

[1] *Supra*, p. 279. He had not always been on good terms with Dioscorus. The latter one day had him whipped and paraded through the streets of Alexandria on a mangy camel: the monk had taken up, we do not know in what connexion, a seditious attitude towards the little-suffering Patriarch (Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 5).

Olives the establishment founded by Melania the younger, with its two monasteries, one for men, the other for women. The pious foundress was no longer there to direct it[1]: her almoner and confidant, the monk Gerontius, succeeded her. In default of Melania another very great lady was living at Jerusalem, in that strange world of monks and pilgrims. This was the widow of Theodosius II., the former Empress Athenais-Eudocia, who had retired to the Holy City some years before. Although she was well versed in literature, there is little probability that she had special competence in theology. But the Council of Chalcedon was the Council of Pulcheria: this did not commend it to her respect: it was also the revenge for the Council of Ephesus, the Council of Dioscorus and of Theodosius II. It is true that in the last days Eudocia had been on very cold terms with the deceased Emperor; but to husbands who are dead much is pardoned. In short, Eudocia shared completely in the views of the insurgent monk.

Gerontius and his friends did the same. The opposition spread like fire in a dry prairie. Euthymius and his congregation were almost the only ones to remain in the path of duty. A number of irreproachable monks, like the future St Gerasimus, the Abbot Romanus of Tekoa, and Peter of Iberia,[2] a former

[1] She died December 31, 439: her mother Albina and her husband Pinianus had preceded her to the tomb (431 or 432).

[2] The life of this personage had been written by Zacharias the Rhetor (*supra*, p. 316, note 1), with those of Theodore of Antinoe and Isaiah the prophet: we no longer possess the first two; on the other hand, another life of Peter of Iberia, greatly extended, written about the beginning of the 6th century, has come down to us in a Syriac version, edited with German translation by Richard Raabe (*Petrus der Iberer*, Leipzig, 1895); *cf.* Chabot, "Pierre l'Iberien" in the *Revue de l'Orient Latin*, iii. (1895), p. 368. Peter was of the family of Bacour, the first Christian King of Iberia (Rufinus, *H. E.* i. 10): in his own country he bore the name Nabarnougi; his father, King Bosmari, had sent him to the court of Theodosius II. as a hostage (422): he was then twelve years old. He edified the Court by his piety; then after some years had elapsed he fled to Jerusalem (430) with a companion who shared his views, John the Eunuch. Being well received by Melania the younger, who had seen him at Constantinople, he received the monastic habit from the hands of Gerontius, and then organized a monastery at the "Tower of David," where he lived in peace with John the Eunuch and several others. But when the Empress Eudocia had settled at Jerusalem, as he was for her an old acquaintance, she disquieted him by her visits so that he fled to the outskirts of Gaza (438). There, very much against his will, he was ordained priest (447).

Caucasian prince who, for the time being, was edifying by his asceticism the neighbourhood of Gaza, lent their support to the movement. Hesychius, a priest whose knowledge and eloquence were in very high esteem, also took sides against the Council.[1] It was understood that Juvenal should not be received, that another bishop should be elected, and that throughout the whole of Palestine, they would replace in the same fashion the bishops who had given way at Chalcedon.[2]

This programme was carried out. Juvenal on his return found himself welcomed by a riot.[3] It was in vain that he offered resistance: all his efforts to make the monks hear reason and to calm them remained without result. The town was in a state of insurrection. The monks had closed its gates and were mounting guard on the ramparts. Within, murder and arson were the order of the day: they had opened the prisons and enlisted the criminals. A deacon had his throat cut and was dragged through the streets. In Juvenal's teeth, his see was declared vacant and Theodosius was acclaimed in his stead. An effort was made to assassinate the former bishop, and if they did not succeed with him, one of his colleagues, Severian of Scythopolis, fell under the dagger of the fanatics. Juvenal escaped to Constantinople.

Eudocia delighted in this rising: she was the soul of it. The movement, further, gained the whole of Palestine. Everywhere Theodosius was installing bishops devoted to himself. It was in these circumstances that Peter of Iberia received episcopal consecration and found himself entrusted with the care of the Church of Maiouma, close to his monastery.

It was not in the name of Eutyches that people had risen in this way. They demanded only the true Faith, that of Nicæa, otherwise called Cyril's, which had been overcome by Leo and the Council of Chalcedon. Whilst the latter was holding its sessions, Eutyches on his way to exile[4] had passed through

[1] *Supra*, p. 241, note 1.

[2] On this business see the two imperial letters addressed, after the repression, to the monks of Sinai and to those of Ælia (Mansi, *Conc.* vii., pp. 484, 483); Cyril of Scythopolis, *Life of Euthymius* (Cotelier, *Ecclesiae graecae monumenta*, vol. ii.), cc. 72-86; Zacharias iii. 3-9.

[3] It is perhaps to this time that we ought to assign the synodal letter of the bishops of Palestine, *Cum summus* (Mansi, *Conc.* vii., p. 520), which is generally placed after the restoration of Juvenal.

[4] We do not know exactly where. It appears that he continued to

Jerusalem where the priest Hesychius had given him hospitality. But the monks did not compromise themselves with him. They condemned him even without hesitation. It was said that Theodosius was personally more favourable to him; but either that was not true or he changed his opinion, for he left the reputation of being an enemy of Eutyches.[1]

Palestine could not be left in a state of revolt. The Government sent troops, and the Count Dorotheus, the military commander, received orders to restore the official bishop. Juvenal returned with him. At their approach the monks set themselves in motion, as of yore the Maccabees had marched against the generals of Antiochus. The encounter took place near Nablus.[2] Parleys were tried; but the monks remained inflexible. It was necessary to employ force: they allowed themselves to be killed rather than yield. Jerusalem was subjected to military occupation: Juvenal re-entered it and material order was almost re-established.

But a long time had yet to pass before they succeeded in pacifying men's minds. Theodosius had been able to escape to Sinai. Peter of Iberia, too, had put himself out of the reach of pursuit. The ex-Empress Eudocia, upon whom they had no hold, remained at Jerusalem and worked zealously to maintain the agitation. Means of moral suasion were tried: Marcian and Pulcheria wrote to the monks[3]; Pope Leo did the same[4]; Euthymius did his best. In short, men's minds calmed themselves little by little. Upon Eudocia the sovereigns of Constantinople had little means of influence: they caused letters to be written to her by other members of her family

make doctrinal statements, for Pope Leo grew uneasy at his propaganda and demanded that he should be sent further away (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 464; *Ep.* cxxxiv., April 15, 454).

[1] Zacharias iii. 9, 10. However I do not know whether from the very insistence used by the Monophysites in relieving Theodosius of the charge of Eutychianism there would not result some confirmation of the imperial words (*supra*, p. 326, note 2) in which this charge is formulated.

[2] Zacharias iii. 5, 6.

[3] Letters cited above, p. 326, note 2: to these should be added the letters of Pulcheria to the Abbess Bassa and to the archimandrites and monks of Ælia, as well as the letter of Marcian to the Synod of Palestine (Mansi, *Conc.* vii., pp. 505, 509, 513).

[4] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 500; *Ep.* cxxiv. He wrote also to Juvenal (Jaffé, *op. cit.* 514; *Ep.* cxxxix.).

and by the Pope. The letter[1] of the latter is a little masterpiece of diplomacy: Leo assumes the royal lady to be occupied in preaching the true Faith and good conduct to the monks of Palestine (alas! she was very far from doing so!), and starting from that assumption he gives her indirect advice.

He wasted his eloquence. To move the intrepid Athenian there was needed the terrible lesson of the catastrophes which in 455 fell upon her family: Valentinian III., her son-in-law, massacred in a rising, Rome pillaged by the Vandals, her daughter and grand-daughters taken captive to Africa. Eudocia humbled herself under the hand of God and consented at last to trouble the Church no more. Theodosius, recaptured by the imperial police, was placed in the charge of the monks of Constantinople, who guarded him down to the time of the death of Marcian which was speedily followed by his own.[2]

It was not only in Palestine that the opposition of the monks showed itself. It made itself heard almost everywhere. In Syria the bishops complained of it strongly.[3] In Cappadocia a certain George made such a twittering that it was heard as far as Rome. Archbishop Thalassius, always a man of peace,[4] tolerated him beyond limit.[5] At Constantinople Carosus, Dorotheus, and their representatives refused to recognize the Council: it was necessary to take them from their monasteries and to assign them others. Carosus, however, yielded after the lapse of some years, and no doubt the case was the same with others.[6] But there always remained in certain monasteries a leaven of opposition; and not only in the

[1] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 499; *Ep.* cxxiii.

[2] Zacharias iii. 9; *cf.* the account of his death written by the author of the life of Peter of Iberia (Ahrens and Krüger, *Zacharias*, p. 257; ed. Brooks in the *Scriptores Syri*, 3rd series, tom. xxv., p. 15). On the death of Marcian he was taken, ill, to the suburb of Sycæ (Galata), where he died December 30, 457: his remains were transported to Cyprus. It was in the monastery of Dius, greatly devoted to the Council of Chalcedon, that he was interned.

[3] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 495, 496; Leo, *Epp.* cxix., cxx.

[4] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 494; *Ep.* cxviii.

[5] Thalassius was a former Prætorian Prefect whom Proclus had abruptly installed in the see of Cæsarea (Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 48).

[6] St Auxentius, a celebrated solitary in the outskirts of Chalcedon, also refused at first to submit to the Council. His biographer (*Acta Sanctorum*, February 14) relates in detail the means by which he was led to do so.

monasteries but among the clergy themselves. Leo often complains of it in his letters. But it was in Egypt that matters took the most regrettable turn.

Dioscorus had been exiled to Gangra in the heart of Paphlagonia. It was no small matter to give him a successor.[1] Orders had been sent to the Augustal Prefect, Theodore. He came to an understanding with the four bishops who after the first session of the Council had deserted Dioscorus, and the electoral assembly was brought together. From this first moment positions were clearly defined. Official people, the notables, individuals who were peaceable either by character or worldly position, accepted with good or bad grace the sentence of the Council and saw nothing improper in the election of a new bishop. The common people, on the other hand, stirred to frenzy by the monks, cried out at the sacrilege. While Dioscorus lived no other ought to be bishop at Alexandria. These protests were disregarded: the authorities, ecclesiastical and civil, were in agreement upon the choice of the arch-priest Proterius, a man in whom Dioscorus apparently had confidence, since it was to him that, on setting out for the Council, he had committed the government of his Church during the interim. In taking him it seems that the authorities wished to diminish as much as possible disagreement with the opposition.

They were hardly successful. The sound of revolt speedily rumbled in the streets of Alexandria.[2] Troops marched: they were put to rout. Driven back into the Serapeum, the soldiers of the Emperor sustained a siege there which turned out badly for them: in the end they were burnt alive. In reprisal, the Government stopped the distributions of corn, closed the baths and the theatres, and immediately despatched reinforcements. The town was subjected to military occupation. Calm appeared once more, but for a moment. The mass of the Alexandrians definitely did not wish for Proterius: they did not cease to make things difficult for him.

His election was notified to Rome in accordance with usage: it seems that his explanations as to the Faith were not very

[1] Liberatus, *Brev.* 14; *cf.* Zacharias iii. 2.

[2] Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 5, refers for this to the testimony of the historian Priscus of Panion who was at that time at Alexandria.

clear, for the Pope asked for others.[1] Leo had only a vague idea of the difficulties among which the unfortunate Patriarch was struggling. Like the imperial government he regarded as disciples of Eutyches all those who resisted the Council of Chalcedon and his own Tome.

The imperial police, placed resolutely at the disposal of Proterius, removed from the episcopal sees everyone who offered opposition. The bishops thus displaced retired where they could except to Alexandria, where residence was forbidden to them.

However, Dioscorus died at Gangra on September 4, 454, after three years of exile. Alexandria at once began to seethe. There was talk of appointing a successor to the dead Patriarch. The officials succeeded in preventing the carrying out of this scheme, and the Emperor thought it a good opportunity to regain the dissenting party. A silentiary named John was sent to Egypt to reconcile them with Proterius.[2] In this he did not succeed, and he returned to the Court with a petition of the Dioscorians.

From the very first the opposition centred in a little committee, of which the leaders, a priest Timothy, surnamed the Cat (Aelurus, Αἴλουρος), and a deacon called Peter the Hoarse (Mongus, Μόγγος) were both called to great celebrity. They had both of them been present at the second Council of Ephesus with their Patriarch Dioscorus, and had remained faithful to him. They were not partisans of Eutyches; far from that, they hunted without pause, him, his doctrine, and his disciples: they were *intransigeant* Cyrillians nothing more. They would not hear mention of the Two Natures, nor of the Tome of Leo, nor of the Definition of Chalcedon. It was for this reason that the Patriarch Proterius had not been able to avoid deposing them. As they were important persons he had thought it his duty to notify their deprivation to Constantinople and to Rome.[3]

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 489; *Ep.* cxiii., March 11, 453; Jaffé, 503; *Ep.* cxxvii., January 9, 454; Jaffé, 505-507, March 10 following.

[2] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 516; *Ep.* cxli., March 11, 455; Zacharias iii. 11. See the letter of Marcian to the monks of Alexandria, of which this envoy was the bearer, Mansi, *Conc.* vii., p. 482, the Latin text, more complete than the Greek.

[3] Letter of Acacius to Pope Simplicius, Thiel, *Epp. Rom. Pont.*, p. 193; *cf.* p. 356 *infra*.

In order to remain attached to Dioscorus they were obliged to pass the sponge over all the monstrous doings of the Council of Ephesus, and in particular over the fact that Dioscorus had there solemnly proclaimed the orthodoxy of Eutyches. It was their weak point. On the other hand they said, following Anatolius of Constantinople, that Dioscorus had not been condemned for his doctrine but only for having excommunicated Pope Leo, wherein, according to his disciples, he had been perfectly right, since Leo was a Nestorian.

This doctrinal position they had maintained before the Emperor Marcian through the intermediation of the silentiary John. They had not succeeded in convincing him; but Marcian soon died (February 457); the people of Alexandria intervened and the position became suddenly very grave.

Pulcheria had died in the summer of 453, more than three years earlier. The race of Theodosius was almost extinct: its sole representatives were a few captive women in Africa, in the women's quarters of the King of the Vandals. In fact the two halves of the Empire were in the power of two barbarian officers, Arians both of them, Ricimer in the West, Aspar in the East, to whom their religion as much as their nationality forbade the giving of the crown. Aspar put that of the East upon the head of one of his trusted supporters, Leo (February 7, 457). As there was no longer any member of the Theodosian family to give him the investiture, it occurred to them to have recourse to the Patriarch Anatolius, and the latter presided at the coronation of the new Emperor. It is the first time that we see the clergy taking part in these political ceremonies.

Aspar and his Emperor could not entertain for the Council of Chalcedon the feelings of Marcian and Pulcheria. The Egyptians[1] suspected this. By an unfortunate coincidence

[1] On these happenings the petitions cited below, p. 333, note 3, give us the Proterian version; the Monophysite version would be represented for us by the counter petition (*ibid.*, note 4) if we had it complete. We have to content ourselves with the accounts of Zacharias iv. 1, 2, 3, and of the biographer of Peter of Iberia, p. 65 (Raabe's edition). Zacharias says that Timothy was consecrated by Peter and two Egyptian bishops whom he does not name: Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 8, has preferred to follow the biographer, whose testimony is confirmed by the petition of the Proterian bishops—a document absolutely contemporary.

their military governor happened to be on tour in the interior: there was therefore every facility for a rising. An attack was made on the principal church, the Cæsareum: the clergy of Proterius were driven from it, and the insurgents proceeded on the spot to the election of Timothy.

The Bishop of Pelusium, who had been ejected for his attachment to Dioscorus, happened to be at Alexandria in spite of prohibitions. He was a very poor sort of person: St Isidore had made great complaint of him.[1] He was brought to the Cæsareum. Two others should have been necessary. Some one bethought himself of Peter of Iberia, the Palestinian bishop, whom the defeat of the Theodosians at Jerusalem had thrown into exile and brought likewise to Alexandria.[2] They succeeded in discovering him: he was borne in triumph to the great church; and Eusebius and he consecrated Timothy as successor of Dioscorus, to the great joy of the populace (March 16, 457).

The festivity was of short duration. The general Dionysius, who had learnt what was going on, made haste to return, arrested the new Patriarch and dispatched him to Taposiris (Abousir). This step, far from calming people's minds, had the result of still further exciting them, to such an extent that it was necessary to recall Timothy, and to try to make the two parties live in peace, while tolerating the schism. Even that attempt did not succeed. On Holy Thursday, March 28, the baptistery of the Church of Quirinus, in which Proterius was officiating, was invaded by a hostile mob. The bishop was massacred[3]; the assassins wreaked their will upon his body, dragged it through the streets, hanged it on the Tetrapylon, and after a thousand outrages and cannibal excesses the populace burnt it and scattered the ashes to the winds (March 28, 457).

Timothy was rid of his rival; but he had on his shoulders a business of the most serious kind. For the moment, however, it seems that a good number of Proterians, wearied

[1] *Supra*, p. 206.

[2] Molested by Proterius, he had been obliged to retire to Oxyrhynchus where he lived for some time; but he had returned to Alexandria and happened to be there at the time of the death of Marcian (*Petrus der Iberer*, p. 64).

[3] The Monophysites alleged that Proterius had been killed by some imperial troops (Zacharias iv. 2; cf. *Petrus der Iberer*, p. 68).

of these interminable quarrels, showed themselves disposed to submit to the Dioscorian Patriarch. But the latter, at the instigation of the fanatics who surrounded him, imposed upon them conditions of too great severity.[1] They went to make their complaints, some of them to Pope Leo,[2] others to the Emperor and to the Patriarch Anatolius.[3] Timothy on his side lost no time. Strong in the enthusiasm of the populace, he proceeded to replace the Chalcedonian bishops everywhere by people devoted to his own views, recast the clergy of Alexandria in the same sense, and replied to the demonstration against him at Constantinople by the despatch of another group of bishops who were commissioned to plead[4] in favour of the revolution which had just taken place.

It was then that the 28th Canon of Chalcedon, so strongly resisted by Pope Leo, played an unexpected part and saved the situation. Anatolius, as we have seen, had no special fondness for the dogma of the Two Natures. It would not have cost him a great effort to change his theology and return to that which he had so long professed.[5] But, since the events at Ephesus, he had become Patriarch of Constantinople, and this position made him a devoted supporter of the Council which had founded his Patriarchate. From the moment that he saw anti-Chalcedonian intrigues arising around him he intervened with vigour and secured that the new government should remain faithful to the decisions of the old.[6]

However, this fidelity to principle had to reckon with the acts which had just taken place in Egypt. The Emperor Leo ordered the punishment of those of the assassins of Proterius who could be discovered[7]; as for the position of Timothy he took a long time to examine it.

[1] Zacharias iv. 3, 4.

[2] On June 1, 457, the Pope had still only very vague news (*quidam rumores*) as to the events at Alexandria (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 457 ; *Ep.* cxliv.).

[3] Petitions presented to the Emperor and to Anatolius by a group of fourteen Egyptian bishops and some priests of Alexandria who had made the voyage to Constantinople (Mansi, *Conc.* vii., pp. 525, 531).

[4] Only the opening of their petition to the Emperor has been preserved to us (Mansi, vii., p. 536).

[5] The Pope made continual complaints of his toleration with regard to the "Eutychians" of Constantinople.

[6] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 520-524 (Leo, *Epp.* cxliv.-cxlviii.) ; 529 (*Ep.* cli.).

[7] Theophanes ad ann. 5951.

The emissaries of the intruded Patriarch were establishing understandings among the clergy of Constantinople, and even at Court. Aspar, the all-powerful Patrician, was not ill-disposed to them. Pope Leo had reason to fear the gathering of a new Council in order to review that of Chalcedon: it was being said that his famous letter was obscure: he was being asked for explanations which, according to him, were superfluous. He was writing in all directions, to Constantinople, to Antioch, to Jerusalem, to Thessalonica, exerting himself to keep everybody in the path of duty. At last the Emperor made up his mind not to assemble a new Œcumenical Council and to consult the episcopate province by province. Two questions were sent to all the metropolitans[1]: Should the Council of Chalcedon be upheld? Should Timothy be recognized as Bishop of Alexandria? To this *questionnaire* were appended the petitions presented to the Emperor by the two parties in Egypt. Each of the metropolitans summoned his Council. The result of this consultation by segments was that the bishops were unanimous in censuring the intrusion of Timothy[2]; in regard to upholding the Council of Chalcedon we do not meet with any case of opposition except that of Amphilochius, the metropolitan of Side, and his comprovincials.[3]

[1] The only ones omitted in the list of persons addressed (*vide infra*, note 2) are those of the provinces of Prævalitana, of Mœsia Superior and of Dacia Ripuaria, which were probably disorganized by the barbarians.

[2] The documents of this business were brought together in a collection called *Encyclia* (Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 9, 10), which Cassiodorus (*Divin. Litt.* 11) caused to be translated by the monk Epiphanius. Of this version a copy (*Parisinus* 12098) has come down to us: it is incomplete, it is true, for it lacks the replies of twenty-two provinces: the three Palestines, Cyprus, Arabia, Cilicia Secunda, Euphratesiana, in the Diocese of the Orient; Bithynia, Honorias, Galatia Secunda, in the Diocese of Pontus; Asia, Phrygia I[a] and II[a], Pamphylia II[a] (Side), Caria, Lycaonia, in the Diocese of Asia; Rhodope, Hemimont, in the Diocese of Thrace; Macedonia I[a] and II[a], Thessaly, in the Diocese of Macedonia; Dacia Interior in the Diocese of Dacia. The Eastern Empire, minus the Diocese of Egypt, included at that time fifty-six provinces.

[3] The letter of the bishops of this province, drawn up by Amphilochius, appeared in the history of Zacharias, where Evagrius (*H. E.* ii. 10) took knowledge of it; but the Syriac text of the *Historia Miscellanea* gives only an abridgement of it. There has been preserved a short phrase of the original Greek (Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, lxxxvi. c. 1841) and some Syriac extracts in the Chronicle of Michael the Syrian (ed. Chabot, ii., p. 145). We can see besides from the letter of another Pamphylian Synod, that of Perga, that

It had been thought worth while also to address questions to some of the monks of highest renown, Simeon the Stylite, Varadatus and James, all three of them Syrians. They gave their opinions in the same sense as the bishops.[1]

It would have been natural to proceed without delay against the Patriarch of Alexandria. However, the process of shuffling was continued. The Pope continued to make constant representations. Instead of doing what he demanded they asked him for legates, for fresh explanations. In the end he sent two bishops, Domitian and Geminian, with a great doctrinal letter,[2] in which he handled the whole dispute again and moderated his style to such an extent that there no longer appears in it the famous expression "in two natures," and that the Monophysite formula is only criticized in it with reserve and in a special acceptation.[3] On this occasion as before he attached to his exposition a whole collection of extracts: he even took care to give a larger place in it to Cyril. On the receipt of this letter the Emperor despatched to Alexandria the silentiary Diomede with instructions to have it read to Timothy. It was undoubtedly for him that it had been written: they thus were showing him much consideration. If the old bigot had allowed himself to be moved, if he had accepted Leo's explanations, what misfortunes would have been spared to the Church! He was inflexible. Diomede returned with a reply of refusal.[4]

the bishops of that country were not completely satisfied with the formulary of Chalcedon. In the letter of Perga a distinction is made between the language of professions of faith or creeds, like the Creed of Nicæa, and the scientific terminology of which use may be made in discussions against heretics. The signatories desired it to be clearly understood that the expression *Two Natures* falls into this latter category. Amphilochius of Side had been suspected, at the Council of Chalcedon, of sharing the views of Eutyches. He was required, at the end of the eighth session, to anathematize them in express terms.

[1] The reply of Varadatus is the only one which appears in the *Encyclia*. Varadatus and Simeon had each written two letters, one to the Emperor, the other to the Patriarch of Antioch, Basil (Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Cod. 229 *ad fin.*; *cf.* Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 10); Evagrius has preserved to us the substance of Simeon's letter to Basil.

[2] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 542; *Ep.* clxv., August 17, 458.

[3] "(Eutychianus qui) Verbi incarnati, id est Verbi et carnis, unam audet pronuntiare naturam" (c. 2).

[4] Zacharias iv. 6 and Michael the Syrian, ed. Chabot, ix. 1; *cf.* Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, lxxxvi., p. 273.

The members of the Court who up to that time had placed their influence at the service of the Egyptian Patriarch felt themselves put out of countenance. Anatolius had just died (July 3, 458): a prelate of more definitely Chalcedonian views, Gennadius, had replaced him in the see of Constantinople. However, some time still elapsed before recourse was had to active measures. They were entrusted to Stilas, the Dux of Egypt, who did not succeed without difficulty. Disturbance broke out—the Proterians supported the forces of police; as many as 10,000 is given as the number of the dead.[1] At last the old pontiff was arrested and sent on the way to Palestine. Thence he was taken to Constantinople, and Pope Leo had reason to fear that after having induced him to sign some vague formula they might send him back to Alexandria.[2] This did not happen, whether because Timothy persisted in refusing any understanding or because the irregularity of his promotion was deemed to disqualify him. He was sent accordingly to Gangra and, as he found means to continue there his activity as an agitator, they despatched him to the other side of the Pontus Euxinus, to Cherson in the Crimea. He remained there for a long time, down to 475, writing incessantly in order to defend his own views and to combat alike the supporters of Eutyches and those of the Council of Chalcedon.[3]

Timothy having thus been put out of the way, they proceeded to the election of another Bishop of Alexandria. The Proterians elected a second Timothy, surnamed Salofaciol (White Turban).[4] He was an excellent man, kind to everybody, even to the fanatics who regarded communion with him with aversion: "We like you very much," they said to him, "but we do not want you for bishop."

He was so accommodating that he even went so far as to

[1] This is what is said by Zacharias (iv. 9), an author with a tendency to exaggeration.

[2] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 546, 547; *Epp.* clxix., clxx., June 17, 460.

[3] On the literary productions of this individual see J. Lebon, "La Christologie de Timothée Elure," in the *Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique*, ix. (1908), p. 677.

[4] Leo replied to the letters by which the accession of Salofaciol was notified to him (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 548-550; *Epp.* clxxi.-clxxiii.). The consecrators were ten in number.

replace the name of Dioscorus[1] in the diptychs, and for this reason was reprimanded by the Pope.[2]

The Egyptians kept themselves quiet: Timothy on his departure had entrusted them to the care of Peter of Iberia. In 471 the exiled Patriarch lost a great protector, the Patrician Aspar, who was massacred with his family at the instigation of the Emperor Leo to whom he had given the throne. Leo himself died in January 474. Since the influence of Aspar had begun to wane there had been seen rising that of an Isaurian adventurer who changed his barbarian name to that of Zeno. The Isaurians, the distant descendants of the pirates exterminated by Pompey, made it their speciality, like the modern Kurds, to scour the roads of upper Asia Minor. Their centre was the town of Isaura, on the Lycaonian side of the Taurus. It was a barbarian element in the interior. Leo thought it a good stroke to set it over against Germanic barbarianism: Zeno received the title of Patrician and the hand of Ariadne, the Emperor's daughter. By her he had a son named Leo, like his grandfather, who proclaimed him Augustus only a few months before he died.

When the succession began (February 3, 474), two persons had the rank of Augustus, the Empress Verina, widow of the late Emperor and her grandson, aged four or five years. It was natural enough that Zeno should seize the power and he did so, though public opinion was little in favour of the brigands of Isauria. His mother-in-law lent her help and a ceremony was arranged in the Hippodrome in which the little Leo put the crown on the head of his father. Shortly afterwards (November, 474) the child died and Zeno remained sole master of power. It was not for long. His private conduct and his method of government awakened such discontent that it was an easy thing to overthrow him. The Empress Verina undertook the task: she set up in opposition to him her own brother, Basiliscus. Zeno lost his head, crossed over to Chalcedon (January 9, 475),[3] and thence fled to Isauria with his wife.

[1] Jaffé, *op. cit.*, 580; *cf.* Zacharias iv. 10.

[2] Evagrius (*H. E.* ii. 11) says that some called him Βασιλικόν, others Σαλοφακίαλον. The first of these two terms means that Timothy was the Patriarch of the Emperor: it is the meaning of the word Melkite, still in use.

[3] The date is supplied by John of Antioch (Müller-Didot, *Fragm. Hist. Graec.*, iv., p. 618; *cf.* De Rossi, *Inscr. Chr.* i., p. 383).

This family revolution was to have the most serious consequences in ecclesiastical affairs. The Church of Constantinople was ruled, since the death of Gennadius (471), by the Patriarch Acacius, a man of discretion, greatly devoted to the interests of his see. Zeno who, in the past, had been somewhat compromised with the Monophysites of Antioch, was now observing in regard to the Council the same attitude as his predecessors. Acacius kept him firm in these views. Over Basiliscus he had not the same influence. The latter had in his *entourage* friends of Timothy Aelurus. Yielding to their advice and, so it was said, to the influence of his wife Zenonis, he recalled the aged Patriarch from exile and gave him an "encyclical" letter,[1] which was entirely in conformity with his views. In this the two Councils of Ephesus were formally recognized and censure was expressed equally of the errors of Eutyches and the doctrinal innovations of Chalcedon. All the bishops were invited to sign this document: a refusal to sign, and in general any sort of manifestation in favour of the Council of Chalcedon, was punished by deposition in the case of clergy, by exile and confiscation for laity.

Timothy triumphed without moderation. Exasperated by his long exile and his interminable controversies, he had seen arrive at last the day of vengeance. He enjoyed it. When he returned from Cherson to Constantinople, the sailors of Alexandria, always numerous at the Golden Horn, acclaimed him with enthusiasm; the populace put itself *en fête;* they pressed upon his steps; they asked for his blessing. It was as a victor that he entered the imperial palace where apartments had been prepared for him. The welcome of the Patriarch Acacius was more cautious. Timothy, it is true, made an attempt to force his hand. He wished to make a solemn entry into St Sophia. But faithful monks barred his road: the other churches were equally closed to him.[2] The anti-Chalcedonian reaction was not calculated to please the Patriarch of the capital. In this connexion his views or his apprehensions were those of his predecessors, Anatolius and Gennadius: he had

[1] Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 4.

[2] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 573, 574, 575 (Thiel, pp. 180, 185, 186). According to a tradition, perhaps legendary, preserved by Theodore the Reader (i. 30), the Patriarch Timothy fell from his ass at the place called Octogonium and hurt his foot.

wind, too, of certain intrigues concocted with the view of dispossessing him of his see. In short, he showed himself very frigid, and refused to sign the Encyclical. His position must have been very strong, for despite the penalties formally laid down he succeeded in holding his ground.

It was not only against this opposition that Timothy had to struggle. There was also that of the Eutychians, against whom he had waged unceasing combat and who were making an agitation at Court, alleging that he was not a very immaculate person and that he ought to be sent back to Cherson.

His friends made him realize that he would do better not to linger in the capital. He embarked for Alexandria. En route he put in at Ephesus, where the triumph began anew. It was the place of the Alexandrian successes: there Nestorius had been vanquished by Cyril and Flavian by Dioscorus. It was also the best base of operations against the Bishop of Constantinople. The Council of Chalcedon was not held in much honour there, precisely because of the famous 28th canon, so dear to the bishops of the capital. Quite recently they had elected and consecrated there a bishop named Paul, without troubling themselves about Constantinople or the canon. Acacius had intervened and had secured the removal of this pretender. Timothy caused him to be recalled. A great council was held of the Bishops of Asia: the Patriarch of Alexandria solemnly recognized the autonomy of Ephesus which had been infringed by the accursed Council. A sentence of deposition was pronounced against Acacius, and in a letter[1] which the assembly addressed to the Emperor, the latter was invited to withdraw himself from the communion of a bishop of such wrong ideas.

At last Alexandria was reached. The debarkation took place in the evening, by the light of torches, amidst a great popular demonstration. Salofaciol, who had been previously requested to remove himself, had retired to Canopus, in the monastery of the Pachomians, where he was living like the monks by the occupation of a basket-maker. Timothy Aelurus

[1] Zacharias, v. 3; Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 5. Evagrius says that he borrowed it from Zacharias. However he is more full than the existing Syriac text, which must have been abbreviated here by the compiler of the *Historia Miscellanea.*

had no difficulty in installing himself again. This time he showed himself more conciliatory, more ready to grant communion with himself, on condition, of course, of condemnation of the Tome of Leo and the Council of Chalcedon. People criticized his moderation: apart from the Eutychians, towards whom he continued his antipathy, certain irreconcilables on his own side held themselves aloof, considering that he was too indulgent towards the converted Proterians. But Timothy let them talk. He even went so far as to trouble about the material necessities of his predecessor. He assigned him a farthing a day, not a very magnificent alms, but sufficient for a monk. The remains of Dioscorus were brought back to Alexandria in a silver casket and deposited in the sepulchre of the bishops.

In Syria also the Monophysite party was marching from success to success. It had deep roots there, in the old docetic tendencies, in the inclinations of mind which here and there survived the defeated heresies of Eunomius and Apollinaris. It must not be supposed, despite the imposing attitude of John of Antioch and his colleagues, that the populations in this country were exactly represented by their body of bishops. From the time of Cyril some measure of opposition showed itself.[1] Monks full of suspicion kept a watchful eye upon the prelates. Constant attendants at sermons in the great churches, they listened to them with malevolent ear and then departed to Alexandria to make reports. Under Dioscorus it had been far worse. It is easy to see, from the story of Ibas and that of Theodoret, how greatly the theology of Antioch was falling into discredit in its own country from which it sprang. From the time of the second Council of Ephesus a number of Syrian prelates had passed over to the opponents of their predecessors. The Government, it is true, under the inspiration of Eutyches and Dioscorus, had assisted this change; but there was something else. The proof of this is the fact that when the wind changed in official quarters, when the Council of Chalcedon had decided in favour of Theodoret and his friends, the Cyrillians, so far from diminishing in importance, became a powerful party which had to be reckoned with. The mass of Mesopotamian monks, especially in the district of Amida and towards the

[1] *Supra*, p. 266.

frontier of Armenia, had been gained over to the Alexandrian theology, not to say that of Eutyches or even of Apollinaris. Almost everywhere, besides, pious souls were inclining towards Monophysitism. They considered it more mystical than the rival doctrine. That was its great attraction. In the second century people had been Modalist through piety, because the system of Noetus and of Sabellius implied a Christ more Divine, so it seemed, than He was in the theology of the Logos. Now they distrusted the Two Natures because the teaching of Leo and of Theodoret did not seem sufficiently to involve the absolute Divinity of Jesus. In the 3rd century and in the 4th the heresies of Paul of Samosata and of Arius had seemed entirely incompatible with piety, and that is why people had turned away from them. In the 5th century the theology of Chalcedon, which people did not readily distinguish from that of Nestorius, was seen in the same angle, an angle which caused trouble. On the one side was the Government, the great Council, the Roman Church: on the other piety towards the Saviour. It was a formidable antithesis! The Monophysites always attributed to themselves a monopoly of devotion. The adhesion not of all the monks but of a very large number of them, and those the most restless, lent support outwardly to this pretension. The party was very frequently persecuted[1]: it was one more recommendation. In fine it was a party genuinely religious, and it is certainly for that reason that there was so much difficulty in overcoming it.

Theodoret had died shortly after the Council of Chalcedon.[2] At Antioch the Bishop Maximus, who had been involved in some proceedings,[3] was replaced in 455 or 456. Under Basil who succeeded him, the town of Antioch was overthrown (458) by an earthquake. We have no record which enables

[1] I hasten to add that when the Monophysites had power in their grasp or when they found themselves in force at some point they showed themselves the most immoderate of men. No religious party, unless it be, perhaps, the Donatists of Africa, has made so large a use of violence.

[2] The last document which mentions him is a letter of Pope Leo (Jaffé, 496; *Ep.* cxx.) of June 11, 453, addressed to him. Gennadius of Massilia (Marseilles), c. 89, makes him die *sub Leone*, that is to say in 457 at earliest. I do not know if great importance need be attached to this testimony. In 458 he had already been replaced.

[3] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 516; *Ep.* cxli.; *cf.* Χρονογραφικὸν σύντομον, p. 131, ed. De Boor; ἐξεβλήθη διὰ πταῖσμα.

us to follow the working of men's minds there. After Basil came Bishops Acacius and Martyrius. It was the last who had to undergo the first assaults of the Monophysite party.

After his marriage with Ariadne,[1] Zeno had caused himself to be sent to Antioch as Commander of the Forces of the Orient: he held the Court of a Vice-Emperor there. With him had come a priest of Chalcedon[2] who had previously been a monk among the Acœmeti (Ἀκοίμητοι) and then had quarrelled with them. He was called Peter and bore the surname of Fuller. The Acœmeti were regarded as greatly devoted to the Council of Chalcedon, a fact which caused them to be treated as Nestorians: Peter the Fuller held views opposed to them. On arrival at Antioch[3] he undertook the guidance of the Monophysite opposition and organized it against the bishop. As the result of a riot Martyrius withdrew and went to make complaints at Constantinople, whilst Peter was installed in his place under the approving eye of Zeno.[4] Supported by his colleague, the Patriarch Gennadius, Martyrius succeeded in exonerating himself from the charges which Zeno and his *protégé* had not failed to raise against him. He returned to Antioch. Peter withdrew for some time; but, as the imperial government had not dared to banish him and he continued to enjoy the protection of Zeno who was on the spot, Martyrius once more had a hard time, so hard that he was disgusted with it, and declared publicly in church that he resigned: "I renounce a rebellious clergy, an unruly people, a church defiled." Without further formality Peter seized the succession.

But this solution did not please Constantinople. Gennadius obtained an order of exile.[5] Peter was already on the way

[1] *Supra*, p. 337.

[2] There he governed the monastery of Saint Bassa, where he seems to have misbehaved himself: *Hoc* (*monasterio*) *propter crimina derelicto, Antiochiam fugisse* (*Gesta de nomine Acacii*, 12; Thiel, *Epistulae Romanorum Pontificum*, p. 518). *Cf.* Theodore the Reader, i. 20.

[3] For what follows see Theodore the Reader, i. 20-22; cf. *Gesta Acacii*, loc. cit.

[4] According to John of Ægeum (*Revue Archéologique*, xxvi. (1873) p. 401) the ordination purports to have been celebrated at Seleucia in Syria by some bishops whom Zeno constrained βιασαμένου τοῦ Πέτρου, ἐπαμύναντος Ζήνωνος.

[5] It is doubtless to this business that there belongs a law of June 1, 471 (*Cod. Justin.* i. 3, 29), forbidding monks to leave their monasteries in

to the oasis where Nestorius had lived a long time, when he succeeded in making his escape and returned to the capital. He was handed over to the Acœmeti. They kept guard over him so long as the Emperor Leo lived († 474). Zeno also left him to them; but when Basiliscus had driven out Zeno and recalled Timothy Aelurus, Peter the Fuller felt that his hour had arrived. They handed back to him again in 475 the see of Antioch, whose new holder, Julian, died in the course of these happenings—of mortification, so it was said.[1] But the triumph of the Monophysites was not lasting: in the following year Zeno re-established himself and Peter received a new order of exile: this time he was despatched to Pityus in the Caucasus. He did not go so far: they were content with interning him at the Euchaites, a famous sanctuary of St Theodore, in the province of Helenopontus. On the vacant throne his partisans made an effort to instal John Codonatus,[2] one of his friends, of whom he had tried to make a metropolitan of Apamea, and who, not having been welcomed in that town, was living provisionally at Antioch. But the Government interfered, and John Codonatus was removed in the same fashion as Peter the Fuller.

In their place the Government secured the enthronement of a certain Stephen[3] who held the see for a short period, and perished, the victim of the Monophysites. They took advantage of a function which had brought him to St Barlaam, a church in a suburb, to make themselves masters of his person, and caused his death by piercing him with pointed reeds (481). As an orthodox election was no longer possible at Antioch, the Patriarch of Constantinople provided for the vacancy by sending Calendion, a bishop ordained by himself.

We see from these narratives what was the power and the daring of the Monophysite party in the old metropolis of the Orient, and how poor a figure was made there from

order to go to create disturbance at Antioch and in the other towns of the Orient.

[1] Theophanes ad ann. 5967.

[2] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 577 (Thiel, *op. cit.* p. 191); cf. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, iii., p. 4 (O. Günther).

[3] The list of bishops of Antioch distinguishes two Stephens; Evagrius and Malalas know but of one only.

that time forward by the theology of Diodore and of Theodore, of Nestorius and of Theodoret.

In Palestine the position was not very different. Anastasius, the successor of Juvenal, very readily signed the Encyclical.[1] All would have proceeded to the taste of Timothy Aelurus, if he had not had against him the Patriarch Acacius.

It was impossible to win over Acacius. Basiliscus and his Court did not frighten him. He had a presentiment that the new *régime* would not last long. The new Emperor was of no greater weight than Zeno. There were speedily signs of discontent, even in the senate. Zeno had taken refuge in the mountains of his native land. Two generals, two brothers, Illus (Ἴλλοῦς) and Trocundus, who were sent against him, had succeeded in blockading but not in taking him. They themselves were also Isaurians.

Negotiations were soon set up between them and the fugitive prince. During this time the Patriarch Acacius was kindling the enthusiasm of the populace of Constantinople. His refusal to sign the Encyclical was a proof that he saw in it a menace to the Faith. Zealots were everywhere acclaiming the bishop for his opposition. Religious processions passed through the streets: at St Sophia was to be seen a mournful spectacle, the throne and the altar draped in black. There was near the town a solitary named Daniel, a native of Syria, who had attempted to reproduce, under a less kindly sky, the original and terrible asceticism of Simeon the Stylite. The faithful thronged, in respectful reverence, around his pillar, from which he never descended, even in the hardest frosts of winter, when the tempests from the North covered him with icicles. The populace having demanded that he should be ordained priest, the Patriarch Gennadius had to have himself hoisted up to the narrow platform which the solitary occupied, in order to perform on it the sacred rites. People came from great distances to see this human prodigy. If some distinguished personage visited Constantinople they did not fail to take him to the Stylite. Acacius succeeded

[1] Zacharias, v. 3, 5. According to this author Anastasius would appear not to have signed the Anti-encyclical (*vide infra*), contenting himself with remaining in communion with those who had done so. *Cf.* Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 5.

in making use of the popularity of this saint. He persuaded him that the peril of the Church was extreme, and that to ward it off he ought to come and make a demonstration in company with his bishop and the faithful of the capital. Daniel descended: enthusiasm was carried to its height: Basiliscus felt the ground trembling beneath him.

From Isauria he received strange tidings. Illus and Trocundus had come to an understanding with Zeno, and after having made him accept their conditions were in course of bringing him back to Constantinople. In haste the "usurper" collected another army and sent it across the Bosphorus. In haste, too, he withdrew his Encyclical. An edict, which people called Anti-encyclical, was published. It contained the annulment of the first, and the restoration of things to their previous position, notably so far as concerned the Patriarchal rights of Constantinople.[1]

This pitiful step did not save Basiliscus. Zeno quickly re-entered the capital (September 476).[2] The usurper and his children fell into his hands: he despatched them to Cappadocia, where they died of hunger in the castle which served them as a prison.

An estimate could be formed at this time of the variableness of the Greek Episcopate. The Encyclical of Basiliscus had been signed everywhere. Figures are quoted of 500 or 700 bishops as having thus abjured both the Tome of Leo and the Decrees of Chalcedon.[3] When the reaction came, they found themselves quite as numerous in acclaiming it.[4]

In his episcopal residence at Alexandria Timothy felt himself stricken with a mortal blow. Adieu to his hope of

[1] The text of it is in Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 7.

[2] Basiliscus had lasted twenty months (Victor Tunnunensis ad ann. 476: Procopius, *Bellum Vand.* i. 7, p. 342, ed. Dindorf. The official notification of Zeno's return to which Pope Simplicius replied on October 9, 477 (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 576) was doubtless only made some months after the re-entry to Constantinople.

[3] There were, apart from Acacius, some cases of local opposition. At Hierapolis (the see in Euphratesiana I think) the populace massacred the officials (*magistriani*) who came there to bring the Encyclical (John of Ægeum, *Revue Archéologique*, xxvi., p. 402).

[4] A great number of bishops came to Constantinople in 477 to acclaim the restoration. Pope Simplicius (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 577) was somewhat disturbed at this concourse there.

taking his revenge upon the impertinent Acacius! It would not be given to him as it had been to Theophilus, to Cyril, and to Dioscorus, to see at his feet his vanquished rival. Constantinople was gaining the day over Pharaoh. Doubtless they would proceed to make him expiate his ephemeral triumph, and perhaps to set him once more on the road to exile.

As a matter of fact a quaestor speedily disembarked at Alexandria as bearer of an order to this effect. But age and vexation had weakened the old Patriarch; they found him ill, and he was allowed to die in peace (July 31, 477).[1]

The police, however, had already taken measures against Aelurus' body of bishops: one only[2] among its members, Theodore of Antinoe, found himself at Alexandria at the moment when the great leader passed away. He made haste to lay his hands on the deacon Peter (Peter Mongus), who, after having become bishop in this hasty fashion, presided over the obsequies of his predecessor and then immediately disappeared in order to escape being arrested. Salofaciol, being officially recalled, left his monastery at Canopus and set the patriarchal house in order. The churches were restored to him, but the opposition deserted them and a return was made to the position of earlier days. Of all this process of change the Patriarch Acacius informed Pope Simplicius in terms of the highest optimism.[3]

However, it was a precarious position. Even with a man like the kindly Salofaciol, pacification made no progress. In Palestine and in Syria the Monophysite party gained in strength and eliminated little by little the Chalcedonian influence. The recent manœuvrings of the episcopate were of a character to show how little attachment there was to the Council. It was defended, it was abandoned, it was adopted again, at the will of the Government. Whatever may be said of the weakness of men's characters, it is none the less true that if the work of

[1] According to the tittle-tattle of his opponents he had poisoned himself (Liberatus, *Brev.* 16). It is more than unlikely.

[2] Letter of Acacius to Simplicius, Thiel, *Epp. Rom. Pont.*, p. 194; cf. *Gesta Acacii*, ibid. p. 516, and Jaffé, *Regesta*, 601. Zacharias, v. 5 and vi. 2, speaks of several bishops.

[3] Letter quoted above, note 2.

Chalcedon had been truly cherished it would certainly have found somewhere in the episcopal body a group of convinced upholders.

The Patriarch Acacius thought all this over in his episcopal palace at Constantinople. It was upon him that there devolved in the last resort all the ecclesiastical affairs of the Eastern Empire: Zeno handed them over absolutely to him. Up to that time he had supported the Council of Chalcedon; but the further matters proceeded the further the course of events inclined him to believe that, if religious peace were really desired, some concessions must be made. No doubt this would be looked at askance at Rome; but they would dispense with the assent of the Pope; if he broke with them, they would be rid of the trouble of his perpetual and unwise interventions. After all, the splendour of the Old Rome had greatly diminished. It had no longer an Emperor: it was a barbarian king who was in command there and a king whose authority did not extend far beyond the bounds of Italy. The Latin Church, submerged from all sides by Germanic invasions, its communications cut with the real Empire, that of Constantinople, no longer understood anything that was happening there, in particular the necessities against which it had to struggle at this time. It was wise to neglect her advice and to save itself without her. If there were occasion, explanation could be made later.

So they reasoned in the governing circles of the Byzantine Church. However,[1] the Patriarch Timothy Salofaciol was seeing the end of his career drawing near. All the efforts that he had made to secure the removal from Alexandria of Peter, his rival, had remained without result. He knew[2] that some understanding was being concocted with that individual. Being very anxious to have an orthodox successor, he addressed himself to the Emperor and sent to him as a representative for this end one of his priests, John surnamed Talaia, a former monk of Canopus. On arriving at Constantinople, Talaia committed the imprudence of entering into close relations with the Patrician Illus. The latter had, six years before, given back the throne to Zeno: but in the course of time they had fallen

[1] On the events which follow see Zacharias, v. 6-12, vi. 1-3; Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 12-16; *Gesta Acacii*, 8-10.

[2] Zacharias, v. 6.

out and the Court attributed to him the darkest designs. There was talk of a conspiracy, and Theognostus, the Prefect of Egypt, was suspected of being deeply involved[1] in it. Talaia, supported by Illus and Theognostus, produced at Constantinople the impression of an intriguer, more busy with his own affairs than those of his Church. He received a promise that the future Patriarch should be chosen to the advantage of orthodox interests; but he had to enter into an undertaking not to claim the position for himself. He returned to Alexandria. Shortly after his return Salofaciol died in June 482. Talaia, after being elected in his place, forgot his undertakings and allowed himself to be enthroned upon the seat of St Mark.

This did not suit the purpose of Acacius, who was meditating allowing the succession of Chalcedonian Patriarchs to fail, as being impossible to uphold in opposition to Egyptian opinion, and coming to an understanding with that of Dioscorus and Aelurus. John Talaia, not having been recognized at Constantinople, and fearing the fate of Proterius, made up his mind to flee to Rome. A new Prefect, Pergamius, was sent in place of Theognostus: he at once entered into negotiations with Peter Mongus, who had hitherto been keeping himself concealed, and presented to him the conditions upon which he could be recognized—the signing of a decree of union, the purport of which was submitted to him, and the admission of the Proterians to his communion.

The decree of union or Henotikon,[2] obviously drawn up by the Patriarch of Constantinople, takes the form of a letter addressed by the Emperor Zeno "to the bishops, clergy, monks, and faithful of Alexandria, Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis." In it the sovereign sets forth his faith, represented by the Creed of Nicæa and that of Constantinople (381). Saddened by existing discords, and in deference to the prayers which have been addressed to him with a view to the restoration of unity, he declares his attachment to these documents while adhering none the less to what was done at Ephesus against Nestorius and against "those who subsequently have thought as he did,"[3]

[1] Zacharias, v. 6; *cf.* Liberatus, *Brev.* 18.

[2] Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 14; Liberatus, *Brev.* 17. The document is not dated: it must belong to 482.

[3] An allusion to the second Council of Ephesus, that of 449, and particularly to the condemnation of Ibas and of Theodoret. On the other

as well as to the condemnation of Eutyches; he accepts also the twelve Anathemas of the Blessed Cyril. He protests that Mary is Mother of God; that the Son of God made man is one and not two; that He is consubstantial with us by His humanity; that in the manner of conceiving of Him, there must be excluded all idea of division, of confusion, of appearances without reality; that there are not two Sons; further that One of the Trinity became incarnate. Whosoever thinks or has thought otherwise, whether at Chalcedon or in any other synod of any kind, he is anathematized, but especially Nestorius and Eutyches.

Of one nature, of two natures, there is no mention. At bottom the document was in agreement with the feelings of which the Greek Episcopate had given evidence at Chalcedon: it left outside the Creed certain controversial formulas, the sense of which had not yet been sufficiently elucidated. It bluntly, openly, gave authority to the doctrine of Cyril and to the formulation of it in the twelve Anathemas. In its substantial content, if we leave out of account the circumstances in which it was put forward, it could not raise any objection from the side of orthodoxy.

The worst of it was that implicitly it allowed to fall both the Tome of Leo and the Dogmatic Decree of Chalcedon, two formulas which for the past thirty years the Government and its officials, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the Greek Episcopate as a whole, in agreement with the Holy See of Rome, had been putting forward and defending as the two-fold symbol of orthodoxy. It was a retreat.

It fell short, besides, of complete success. The Monophysites considered the Henotikon insufficient. Peter Mongus, it is true, accepted it, and after this he was immediately recognized as official Patriarch and admitted to communion with Constantinople. But this arrangement did not please all his supporters. Accustomed as they were to treat with insult on every opportunity the Tome of Leo and the Council of Chalcedon, they were not content with the tacit disavowal of them made by the decree of union. Protests were raised from all sides. The Patriarch set his wits to work in appeasing them: the names of Proterius and of Timothy Salofaciol were erased

hand the reprobation of Eutyches agrees implicitly with Flavian's Synod and the Council of Chalcedon.

from the diptychs: the body of the latter was taken from the burial place of the patriarchs and moved elsewhere. Peter brought out some old sermons in which he had formerly held less measured language, and declared that he had not changed his views. He even went so far as to speak against the Council, while avoiding on the other hand too precise anathemas, for an eye was being kept upon him from the official side and the magistrates made enquiry occasionally as to his statements. At the same time that he was writing to Acacius letters full of respect for the Council,[1] his supporters were fabricating and putting into circulation a whole supposititious secret correspondence[2] in which the rôles were strangely reversed. In this was to be seen Acacius, disabused of Leo and the Council, prostrating himself at the feet of the Patriarch of Alexandria, imploring clemency for the past, accepting and performing in the most profound mystery the penance inflicted on him by Peter Mongus and finally obtaining from him recognition as Archbishop of Constantinople and admission to his communion.

Nothing came of it. The opposition became more and more threatening. The Patriarch had recourse to measures of severity and issued harsh edicts against certain monasteries. This made a commotion: complaints were carried to the Emperor, who showed himself little gratified by the fact that, despite his Edict of Union, discord was returning in the most vigorous fashion. An official named Cosmas was despatched to Alexandria. On his arrival the opposing party organized an enormous demonstration. Near a church in the suburbs 30,000 monks assembled with Theodore, Bishop of Antinoe, at their head, the very man who had laid hands on the Patriarch Peter. Thirty thousand monks! And soldiers were wanting on the frontiers, even on the frontiers of Egypt! This concourse purported to be coming to town in order to ascertain the theology of the Patriarch. Only 200 of them were allowed to enter as delegates; they came to the Great Church where Cosmas was present with the clergy. Peter Mongus, one of the ablest exponents of balancing that Byzantine theology has produced, found means of making them

[1] Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 17.

[2] Amelineau, "Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Egypte chrétienne," in the *Mémoires de la Mission du Caire*, iv., p. 196.

understand that he held Leo and Chalcedon in horror, without however employing terms of too great definiteness which would have startled the officials. The monks judged him to be orthodox; but they continued to wish to be rid of him, because he remained in communion with Acacius and other "Chalcedonians."

However, the project which had already been formed of electing a successor to him was not carried into execution. Cosmas gave back the monasteries that had been confiscated: the monks, while continuing to murmur strongly, retired; the populace, wearied by so many exactions, was beginning to regard them unfavourably. However, the opposition held its ground and continued to agitate: a certain Nephalius was the moving spirit. As it had not been constituted a separated church the dissidents were styled Acephali. The Henotikon, in fine, had not set the Egyptian Patriarch on a bed of roses.

The Patriarch of Antioch, Calendion, was not willing to accept it. He found himself at this moment in a peculiar position. The disagreement between Illus and Zeno had become singularly aggravated. The Empress Ariadne had attempted to rid herself of the Patrician by procuring his assassination. The blow failed, or mainly did so. However, Illus thought that the air of Constantinople was becoming unhealthy for him. He caused himself to be sent to the Orient with extraordinary powers. His brother Trocundus accompanied him with a former Professor at Athens, a certain Pamprepius, one of the last representatives of theurgic Neoplatonism. He was the magician of the establishment: he seems to have had sufficient importance to give to the movement which was in preparation the appearance of a pagan reaction.[1] There speedily arrived another general, the commander of the armies of Thrace, who was named Leontius. Popular excitement was stimulated. When Illus judged that the hour had come, he proclaimed his colleague Leontius Emperor and caused him to be invested by Zeno's own mother-in-law, the Empress Verina. Political circumstances had led this princess to reside, against her will, in Isauria, in the fortress of Papyrion. Illus had her removed from it and brought her to Tarsus. She crowned

[1] On the hopes excited at this time among the pagans of Caria, see the life of Severus by Zacharias the Rhetor (*Patrol. Orientalis*, ii., p. 40).

Leontius and notified his accession to the peoples of the Empire by an official letter (*sacra*),[1] in which she explains that as depositary of the imperial tradition she is using her prerogatives to replace Zeno, who is unworthy of his commission, by a new Emperor. The higher clergy of Syria had to accept the "usurper." How were they to have resisted? But when Zeno had regained the upper hand, when Illus, Leontius, and Pamprepius had been reduced to shutting themselves up in the asylum of Papyrion, they had to reckon with the victors. The Patriarch Calendion was treated as a State criminal and sent off on the road to the Great Oasis. Peter the Fuller, recalled from the Euchaites, saw himself, for the fourth time, installed in the Apostolic See of Antioch. This time the installation was final. He accepted the Henotikon. We hear no suggestion that he had, like his colleague of Alexandria, to struggle against an opposition composed of irreconcilables.

Peter was a great liturgist. He knew to what an extent customs in worship can exert influence upon religious thought. It is to him that the practice goes back of reciting in the Mass the Credo of Nicæa. In his view it was a protest against the Council of Chalcedon. The Monophysites took every opportunity of repeating that they desired only the Creed of Nicæa and repudiated all others. He attempted also to complete the Trisagion. To the hallowed words, "Holy God, Holy and Mighty, Holy and Immortal," he added, "Crucified for us, ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμῶν." This was equivalent to the formula *Deus passus* which had been used without specific implication before all these controversies. Now it was plainly a profession of the unity of nature.[2] Calendion, with a view to settling matters, had conceived the idea of inserting between the primitive text and the heretical addition the words, "Christ our God"—which saved the situation and orthodoxy. But this correction, like many other wise things, met with little success. The "Crucified for us" without any softening became the battle cry of the Monophysites, just as the *Deo Laudes* had been that of the Donatists.

[1] Theophanes ad ann. 5974.

[2] The *Theotokos* is in itself quite as open to criticism as the *Crucifixus pro nobis*. We may note the analogy between Calendion's combination and that which Nestorius had proposed with his *Christotokos*.

As for the Syrian bishops the affair of Illus furnished a political pretext for getting rid of the most zealous Chalcedonians.[1] The others yielded to circumstances, accepted the Henotikon, and entered into communion with the new Patriarchs of Antioch and of Alexandria.[2] It was the same in Palestine. Anastasius, Juvenal's successor, had adhered with his Council to the Encyclical of Basiliscus and had not retracted.[3] Martyrius, who replaced him about 478,[4] also showed some measure of detachment from the Council of Chalcedon. These prelates, in the same way as those of Alexandria, had to struggle against a monastic opposition of an obstinate kind which rebelled against compromises. The Henotikon, though well received by Martyrius,[5] did not allay all elements of resistance. However, thanks to the intervention of a monk who was highly respected, Marcian of Bethlehem,[6] the greater number of the dissidents came over. There remained only a small group whose leaders were Gerontius, the former almoner of Melania the younger, and Romanus, superior of the monastery of Tekoa. Peter of Iberia himself also remained opposed to the reunion. Driven from his bishopric of Maiouma, he was wandering with but a sparse attendance along the Syrian coast, evading as well as he could the searches of the police. The same was the position of two

[1] Theophanes (ad ann. 5982) mentions the Bishops of Tarsus, Hierapolis, Cyrrhos, Chalcis, Samosata, Mopsuestia, Constantina, Himeria, Theodosiopolis.

[2] Letter addressed to Peter Mongus by a Council of Antioch, Zacharias, v. 10.

[3] Zacharias, v. 2, 5. [4] Zacharias, v. 6.

[5] There is a discourse of his in Zacharias, v. 6. In this he belauds the three Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, and Ephesus, and rejects whatever may have been decided in a contrary sense at Ariminum, Sardica, Chalcedon, or elsewhere. See also (Zacharias, v. 11) his letter to Peter Mongus. The Life of St Euthymius (cc. 113, 114) bears trace of this.

[6] According to Cyril of Scythopolis, in the life of St Euthymius, 123, 124 (*Acta Sanctorum*, January, vol. ii., p. 686; Cotelier, *Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta*, ii., p. 305), Marcian seems to have summoned a meeting at Bethlehem of all the dissident monks and, finding them greatly perplexed, to have persuaded them to have recourse to the lot. They accordingly tossed up whether they should unite to the bishops or not: the lot fell for reunion. Zacharias, v. 6, says nothing of this original method of procedure.

Egyptians of mark, the Bishop Theodore of Antinoe and a kind of prophet named Isaiah,[1] like the prophet of the Old Testament. Isaiah and Peter died in 488.[2]

Such in the East was the doctrinal position. We must now see what estimate was formed of it at Rome.

Since the death of Aelurus and the restoration of Timothy Salofaciol, Pope Simplicius was breathing more freely. However, he took to heart the toleration exercised in regard to Peter Mongus, the Alexandrian anti-Pope, and did not cease to write to the Emperor and to Acacius[3] with demands that he should be exiled. Great was his terror when, in the middle of the year 482, he received at the same time both letters from Alexandria notifying to him, along with the death of Salofaciol, the accession of John Talaia, and an imperial missive in which Talaia was accused of perjury while Peter Mongus was mentioned with eulogy, and a suggestion was even made of giving him the succession. He wrote at once to Constantinople to hinder the nomination as Patriarch of a man so unworthy as Peter: at every opportunity he urged Acacius to intervene, and from the outset to send him information.[4]

It was in vain: Acacius sent not a word of reply. However, Simplicius died on March 10, 483, after an illness of some duration. Immediately after his installation his successor Felix III. entered into this business with the resolution of a Roman of olden time. During the illness of his predecessor, John Talaia had arrived from Alexandria with definite informa-

[1] The latter, however, seems to have shuffled: in spite of his *intransigeance* in principle he showed himself conciliatory enough in practice.

[2] The Lives of these three individuals were written by Zacharias the Rhetor (*supra*, p. 316, note 1), who seems to have published them about 518, dedicating them to a chamberlain named Misael. We now only possess, and that only in Syriac, the Life of Isaiah. See Kugener in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, ix. (1900), pp. 464 ff. On Isaiah see Vailhé, *Echos d'Orient*, ix. (1906), pp. 81 ff. The Syriac text of the Life of Isaiah is in vol. iii. of Land's *Anecdota Syriaca*, p. 346: there is a German version in Ahrens and Krüger, *Die sogen. Kirchengesch. des Zacharias rhetor*, p. 263; texts and Latin version by E. W. Brooks in the *Corpus Scriptorum Christ. Orient. Scriptores Syri*, Third Series, vol. xxv.

[3] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 579-582, 584.

[4] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 586-589; cf. *Gesta Acacii*, 10, 11.

tion. He laid a formal complaint against the powerful Patriarch of Constantinople. Felix at once organized a mission, composed of two bishops, Vitalis and Misenus, and a Roman "defensor" whose name was also Felix. These persons were commissioned to carry to the Emperor and to Acacius letters of a very urgent character[1]; one of these letters,[2] addressed to the Patriarch, was a citation to appear to answer the complaint of his colleague of Alexandria. In this the legates had a task of great delicacy; but they had been enjoined to enter into relations with the convent of the Acœmeti, which was very zealous for the Council of Chalcedon, and especially with their abbot, the monk Cyril.

On landing at Constantinople the envoys of Pope Felix were at once put into strict confinement, and then so effectually instructed in the right way that they allowed their letters to be taken, and consented to be present at Acacius' services. Acacius took advantage of their presence to place solemnly upon the diptychs the name of Peter Mongus. This, for the general public of the capital, was the ratification of what had taken place since the previous year, the approval of the Roman Church given to the Henotikon and to the arrangements at Alexandria. There were, however, at Constantinople, especially in certain monasteries, persons capable of understanding both the intentions of the Holy See and the intrigues of the Patriarchate. The Acœmeti sent to Rome. When the legates returned they found the Pope in possession of information, and, as may easily be conceived, extremely incensed. On July 28, 484, a synod of seventy-seven bishops met in the presence of the Pontiff, pronounced against them a double sentence of deposition and excommunication; and then, without adjournment, deposed as contumacious the presumptuous Patriarch of Constantinople.[3]

It was a grave step assuredly, but inevitable. Acacius, fortified by an ecclesiastical authority which was still strongly challenged, or rather by his personal influence over the Emperor, had arrogated to himself the power to deal as he thought fit with the great Council of Chalcedon, and that without even taking the trouble to give notice thereof to the

[1] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 591-595. [2] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 593.

[3] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 599-604. Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 18-21, makes use of the Acts of this Council which have not come down to us.

Pope of Rome, a principal party in this matter. To the explanations that had been demanded of him he had replied only by a disdainful silence; and when the Pope had sent in person to seek for them at Constantinople, he had shut up the envoys of the Holy See, had laid hands upon their papers and had taken advantage of their inexperience to lead them to authorize what they had been sent to forbid. *Multarum transgressionum reperiris obnoxius*, says the Pope in beginning his letter of excommunication.[1] Then he enumerates these transgressions, numerous, outrageous, proved to the hilt, and ends: "By virtue of the present sentence which we[2] send thee by Tutus, a *defensor* of the church, go in company with those whom thou seekest so willingly (Mongus and his supporters). Thou art deprived of the *sacerdotium*, cut off from the Catholic communion and from the number of the faithful: thou hast no longer right either to the name of priest nor to sacerdotal functions. Such is the condemnation inflicted upon thee by the judgement of the Holy Spirit and the apostolic authority of which we are the depositaries, without any possibility of ever being released from the anathema."

Besides this document, which was addressed to Acacius himself, a short note drawn up, I think, with a view to being exhibited in public placards, contained simply the following:—

"Acacius, who in spite of two warnings has not ceased to disregard salutary ordinances, who has dared to imprison me in the prison of my representatives,[3] God, by a sentence pronounced from heaven, has ejected from the sacerdotal office. If any bishop, clerk, monk, or layman after this notification shall hold communion with him, let him be anathema: by command of the Holy Spirit."

Acacius had certainly deserved the severe stroke which fell upon him. Yet there was small probability that the Roman sentence would be executed in the East, that communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople would be abandoned by his clergy, his flock, and the Byzantine Episcopate.

[1] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 599.

[2] The letter is in the name of the Council; after Felix the seventy-seven bishops appended their signatures to it.

[3] *Meque in meis credidit carcerizandum.* The insult had been keenly felt.

It was thus a rupture not only with Acacius but with the Greek Church as a whole. Pope Felix III. has been the subject of severe criticisms on account of it. However, it ought to be recognized that if he declared the rupture, it was not he who created it: it existed already, by the action of Acacius. In uniting himself with the Monophysites the Patriarch knew well that he could not count on the approval, or even on the silence, of the Holy See. Just as he had abandoned the Council of Chalcedon in an oblique and hypocritical fashion, in the same way also he broke with Rome without declaring the rupture, while leaving without reply all the questions of Simplicius, confiscating the first letters of Felix and tricking his legates. It is not thus that people act towards those with whom they desire to remain in relations. It was perhaps on his part a supreme act of astuteness to cause the Pope to decree a schism which was his own doing.

At bottom, what he desired was an Imperial Church, of which he would have been the sole Head. Despite all the Roman protests, his predecessors and he had not ceased to exercise, even to reinforce, their jurisdiction over the "Dioceses" of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, which had been subordinated by the Council of Chalcedon to the see of Constantinople. He had no scruple in intermeddling in the affairs of Illyricum and even in intervening in the Patriarchate of Antioch, weakened by so many vicissitudes. It was thus that he had nominated to Tyre, the first see after that of the Patriarch, John Codonatus, the accomplice of Peter the Fuller.[1] Besides, the Patriarchs of the Orient, the Patriarch of Egypt in the same way as those of Syria, held their positions only by his favour, because he pleased to uphold them. In fact, everywhere where the officials of the Emperor Zeno went, the influence, the authority of the Patriarch Acacius was likewise recognized and active.

Such a system clashed with a twofold traditional conception, that of Christian unity and that of the superior part assigned to the Roman Church in the organization and preservation of this unity. But the Patriarch told himself, perhaps, that to the east of the Empire there was a Church[2] which lived its own life, without regular relations with the rest of the Christian

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 599.

[2] See the following chapter.

world, a Church in which Rome was known only by name and which maintained itself in an attitude of jealous mistrust in regard to Constantinople and Antioch. He was aware also that the whole of the old Latin Empire, Africa, Spain, Britain, Gaul, and even Italy herself had fallen bit by bit into the hands of the barbarians: that among those strange sovereigns who sat enthroned in the Latin capitals, at Carthage, at Arles, at Ravenna, not a single one was a Catholic: all were Arians: there were even some, in the North of Gaul and in Britain, who were not Christians of any sort. What was to be done with this West? Was it not past hoping for? Let the Pope of Rome make for himself what he could of this state of dissolution and this barbarism. Since, at the centre of the world, there was an Empire that was Christian, truly Christian, from the sovereign down to the last of his subjects, since in this Empire there lived unchanged the Roman tradition, it was that alone which counted. Let us leave on one side in the East the fire-worshippers, in the West the followers of Arius. Without excluding from the ideal unity of the Christian Church the peoples subject to their yoke, let us not admit that thence there should come to us directions for our religious affairs.

Such were, I believe, the thoughts of Acacius. They might, for the moment and in his circle, seem well grounded enough; but the event proved that they were in advance of the actual position: the schism, though long and lamentable, was not, this time, final.

The "defensor" Tutus, commissioned to carry the sentence of the Roman Council, for it would not do to think of sending bishops, succeeded in evading the police officers who guarded the Strait of Abydos (Dardanelles). He penetrated unperceived into Constantinople and put himself into communication with some monks devoted to the Pope.[1] These charged themselves with securing the delivery of the document. After several fruitless attempts they succeeded in pinning it to the

[1] Belonging to the monastery of the Acœmeti according to Zacharias, quoted by Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 18 (the Syriac says nothing of this), and Liberatus, *Brev.* 18; to the monastery of Dius, according to Basil the Cilician, author of an Ecclesiastical History (Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 42) which went down to 527, quoted by Nicephorus Callistus, *H. E.* xvi. 17. *Cf.* Pargoire, *Echos d'Orient*, vol. ii., pp. 367 ff.

Patriarch's pallium during a ceremony in St Sophia. Acacius had these presumptuous fellows[1] chastised, and erased the name of Felix from the diptychs of his church.

[1] According to Theophanes, ad ann. 5980, some of them seem to have been put to death, others thrown into prison. The *defensor* Tutus himself also ended by suffering himself to be corrupted. On his return to Rome he was deprived of his position and excommunicated (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 608).

CHAPTER XIII

CHRISTIANITY EAST OF THE EMPIRE

THE eastern frontier of the Empire had never marked the limit of Christian expansion. Beyond the provinces regularly administered by Byzantine officials, there had for long been living churches different in language and nationality, to which we must now turn our attention. I have already spoken[1] of the missions among the Goths at the time when that people was still dwelling to the north of the Pontus Euxinus and of the Christian settlements established in the Tauric Chersonese (Crimea). Let us now finish the religious circumnavigation of the Black Sea and thus arrive at the great Churches of Armenia and of Persia.

1. *The Caucasus.*

On the other side of the strait from which it derived its name, the town of Bosphorus or Panticapeum possessed a "factory" called Phanagoria with a bishopric which seems to have been intermittent. The first holder of it that we meet with belongs to the year 519.

Further along there emptied itself into the Pontus Euxinus the river Hypanis, the modern Kouban. Then the high wall of the Caucasus began to rear itself, sheer above the sea. In its folds lived populations of warlike and free-booting propensities, akin to the modern Circassians. Finding little to live upon in their forests and their rocky heights, they were accustomed to scour the sea, to the great detriment of Greek commerce which even in these lost lands had colonies, Nicopsis, Pityus, Dioscurias.[2] Christianity early planted itself there. It is in these almost fabulous countries that ancient legends represent as travelling the apostles Andrew, Peter, and Matthias; a Bishop of Pityus took part, in company with

[1] Vol. II., pp. 448 ff.

[2] Tuapse, Pizunda, Soukoum.

the Bishop of Bosphorus, in the Council of Nicæa. Later on the Roman settlements passed through some rather bad times; but Justinian intervened with energy, rebuilt the fortresses, and reorganized the ecclesiastical administration. After him we find a bishopric at Nicopsis in Zichia and another at Dioscurias, then called Sebastopolis.[1]

To the south of this town there opened out the plain of Phasis or Colchis, behind which, as far as the Caspian Sea, there stretches the long valley of the Kour with the provinces of Iberia and Albania. Over the populations of these countries there reigned a dynasty of Iranian origin, whose capital was at Metzketh, to the north of the present town of Tiflis.[2] Like Armenia, and for the same reasons, this country was divided between Persian influence and Roman protection. In the time of Constantine the Christian religion had been introduced there in very touching circumstances. Near the royal residence lived a Christian captive whose virtue and piety attracted general attention. She obtained by her prayers the healing of a child and then of the Queen herself. The latter began already to talk of embracing the religion of her benefactress: the king wished to wait. Another marvel brought him to a decision. They built a church at this time, according to the directions of the captive, and then addressed themselves to the Emperor Constantine in order to procure priests. Thus was organized the Christianity of Iberia. This story was told to Rufinus by another Georgian king, Bacour, who held a position in the Roman army.[3] From Georgian tradition we learn that the converted king was called Mirian and the captive Nina. In the following century another prince of the royal family, Nabarnougi, better known under the name of Peter of Iberia, played an important part in the religious affairs of the Empire.[4]

[1] Procopius, *De Aed*, iii. 7.

[2] Tiflis was only founded about the middle of the 5th century.

[3] Rufinus, *H. E.* i. 10. When Rufinus knew him he was *Dux Limitis Palaestini*: later he became *Comes Domesticorum*. He appeared at the Battle of the Cold River (394) among the principal lieutenants of Theodosius and fell in action (Zosimus, *H. E.* iv. 57, 58; Socrates, *H. E.* v. 25).

[4] *Supra*, pp. 325 ff.

2. *Armenia.*

To the south of Iberia the Armenian Mountains rear themselves from the Desert of Iron as far as the Cappadocian plateau, around which they project the chains of Pontus and of Anti-Taurus. From their flanks break forth some famous streams: towards the Pontus Euxinus the Lycus, the Acampsis, and the Phasis; towards the Caspian Sea the Kour and the Araxes; then the two Euphrates and the Tigris, whose folds enclose the great plain of Aram and reach at last to that arm of the Indian Ocean which we call the Persian Gulf.

The story of the men who lived in these high valleys was early intermingled with that of their neighbours below, the ancient peoples of Assyria and Chaldæa. The most ancient records are the inscriptions of Nineveh, which of course only speak of them in connexion with victories won in the mountain by the armies of Assur.

But just as the Assyrians had taught their neighbours the cuneiform script, the latter made use of it in their turn to write in their language and from their point of view the narrative of their great deeds. With these records of differing origin we can go back as far as the 9th century B.C. We see there that the mountaineers who designated themselves by the name of Chaldees (Χάλδοι) were called *Ourartou* by their neighbours; this last name corresponds very well with that of Ararat employed in the Biblical documents[1] of the 8th century and the 7th to denote their country.

The language of these Ourartic inscriptions has not yet been able to be classified with precision: it is, however, certain that it has no similarity to modern Armenian. The people who spoke it seem to have come from the East or the North, and its expansion was effected rather in the direction of the West. The political centre and the royal residence were situated near Lake Van (Thospa), whose formidable crag provided a citadel: there was the sanctuary of the national goddess, Khaldis.

[1] IV. [II.] Kings xix. 37; Isaiah xxxvii. 38; Jeremiah li. 27. As for the identification of the famous mountain of Agri-Dagh with the Ararat of Genesis, first made by St Jerome, it seems to have remained unknown to the Armenians down to the 9th or 10th century.

After many struggles, that is to say many marauding expeditions, the masters of the plain succeeded in overcoming the mountaineers. Van was taken and burnt, except for the fortress, by King Tiglath Pileser (736). However, the little nation maintained its independence down to the following century. It was then that the land was submerged by the great flood of the peoples whom we call Cimmerians or Scythians. When it retired it left behind it a tribe hitherto unknown to history, that of the *Hayk*,[1] as they still call themselves, the Armenians as they are styled by the Persians and the Greeks. The new-comers rolled back the former inhabitants of the country eastwards and even ended by assimilating them. They were not Iranians: at length, however, they conformed themselves in many things to the customs of the Medes and the Persians, their mountain neighbours and soon their political masters.

Under the Achæmenids[2] and, after the death of Alexander, under the Seleucidæ, the Armenian countries formed two satrapies; but, especially in the latest days, indigenous dynasties had been planted here and there. Their submission, almost a nominal one, gave place to complete independence when Antiochus the Great had been beaten at Magnesia by the Romans (190). Three Armenian kingdoms made their appearance at that time. That of Little Armenia, to the west of the Upper Euphrates, between that river and Cappadocia, fell later into the hands of Mithradates, in whose heritage the Romans found it (65). They gave it to vassal kings whose line extended nearly to the time of Vespasian. Then it was reunited to the province of Cappadocia. The two other kingdoms extended to the east of the Euphrates Superior, one of them northwards in the direction of the Caucasus and of Media — it is that of Great Armenia; the other southwards to beyond the Tigris—the kingdom of Sophene. This last kingdom, reunited to the former by King Tigranes, received shortly afterwards a capital, Tigranocerta.[3] In Great Armenia

[1] *Hayk* is a plural: the singular is *Hay*. They have been identified with the Hittites of Asia Minor.

[2] Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, i., p. 744; ii., pp. 56, 265: iii., p. 65; v., p. 339. *Cf.* Th. Reinach, *Mithridate Eupator*, pp. 78, 101.

[3] In an unidentified position in the neighbourhood of Mardin. See Sachau's memoir in the *Abhandlungen* of the Berlin Academy, 1880.

the centre of government was to the north of the Araxes, at Artaxata, a town situated in a position selected, so it was said, by Hannibal. In the time of Marcus Aurelius it was transferred to Valarschapat, a little further west, where the Romans had built a new town (Καινὴ πόλις, Nor-Khalakh).

Great Armenia, restored by Lucullus and Pompey (66 B.C.) to the natural limits which it had overstepped under Tigranes, was considered together with the Caucasian States, Iberia and Albania, and sometimes also Media Atropatena, as forming part of the Roman Empire. However, it was not a province. The indigenous kings had been maintained in it. These princes were most frequently connected by kinship or alliance with those of the Parthian kingdom. Their subjects, as I have said, were Iranized at an early date. Hellenism did not make any impression among these populations. The Roman garrisons established at certain points, at Ziata (Kharpout), in the former kingdom of Sophene, at Gorneæ (Garhni) near Artaxata, were no more successful in exercising any transforming influence. Although clients of the Romans, the Armenians did not resemble them in any way: it was with their neighbours the Parthians that they had most connexion. This false position was the source of endless wars between Rome and the Parthian Empire. In the 3rd century, after the campaigns of Septimius Severus, the Romans succeeded in establishing themselves firmly in Mesopotamia: Nisibis, two days' march from the vanished Tigranocerta, became their principal stronghold in these countries.

It was about this time that the Iranian Empire passed into the hands of the Sassanids. The royal family of Armenia, closely related to the dethroned Arsacids, could not fail to be hostile to the "usurpers." War broke out anew between the mountaineers and their neighbours to the south; and it was not only a political war. The Sassanids, ardent propagators of the Mazdæan religion, endeavoured to make it prevail in Armenia.

The position became easier about 261, thanks to the intervention of Odenath of Palmyra who restored in these Eastern territories the authority of the Roman Empire and the fortune of its allies. Compromised for a moment by the disaster of Zenobia (272), this restoration was confirmed again by the victories of Carus (282) and of Galerius (297). Armenia

numbered once more among the clients of Rome, preserved its independence in relation to the Persian State.

Nevertheless, Diocletian judged it advantageous to rectify, on the upper Tigris, the traditional frontier. In the conventions in which the war of 297 ended, several provinces of Southern Armenia were annexed. This annexation completed the successive attachment to the Empire of all the lands which had once formed the kingdom of Sophene.

The boundaries established in 297 were not destined to be maintained for an indefinite period. By the treaty concluded in 363 between the Emperor Jovian and Sapor II., the Roman frontier was withdrawn to the west of Nisibis, to the south of the Tigris; on the left bank of this river it went back from the eastern Tigris as far as Nymphios. At the same time the Empire had to renounce the traditional protectorate that it exercised over Armenia. To this it did not resign itself easily: a fact which produced, from the reign of Valens onwards, an unfailing crop of difficulties. Under Theodosius (*c.* 387) the governments of Constantinople and of Ctesiphon made up their minds to divide between them the disputed territory. The King of Kings obtained the lion's share, four-fifths of the Armenian territory: the Roman Empire had Erzeroum (Garin, Theodosiopolis), and some districts in the western part.

The Armenian lands annexed to the Empire entered, some at once, others but slowly, into the provincial organization. Armenia Minor had been, as I have already said, incorporated in the province of Cappadocia about the time of Vespasian. Diocletian made a special province of it, and this was divided into two, under Valens or under Theodosius, and thus gave an *Armenia Prima* and an *Armenia Secunda* with metropolises at Sebaste (Sivas) and at Melitene (Malatia). The province of Mesopotamia, organized by Septimius Severus, remained for a long time undivided; but in the end it was dismembered about the same time as Armenia Minor. In the land of Aram they cut off a province of Osrhoene, giving to it at the same time Edessa as capital. The name of Mesopotamia was reserved to the valley of the western Tigris, which had for its principal town Amida (Diarbekir), founded about 340 by the Emperor Constantius. To the north of Amida and of the Tigris began the Armenian land properly so called. It was

administered for the Empire by satraps, hereditary[1] at first, and then, beginning from the reign of Zeno (*c.* 480), revocable like the governors of provinces but always chosen among the native inhabitants. Justinian put an end to the *régime* of the satraps, and rearranged on this side the provincial boundaries.

It is Eusebius who is the first[2] to speak of Christian Armenians. In connexion with the persecution of Maximin Daia (311-313) he relates that this prince "endeavoured to compel the Armenians to sacrifice to idols." These Armenians, he says, had long been *friends and allies* of the Romans: they were Christians and observed their religion with devotion. Maximin thus rendered them disaffected, and made himself enemies.

These are not the terms in which *subjects* of the Empire would be referred to. We are then not in Little but in Great Armenia. On the other hand, it is scarcely conceivable that the Emperor could have taken measures of religious constraint in a land where he had not direct authority, in a land governed by an allied king. There is here, then, an apparent contradiction. It would resolve itself if we identify the Armenians with whom Maximin was dealing with the inhabitants of that part of Great Armenia which Diocletian in 297 had joined to the Empire, while causing it at the same time to be governed by native princes. Sophene, the most western of these districts, the nearest to Melitene and to Little Armenia, sometimes gave its name to the whole of the Roman satrapies. It is, I think, with this country that we are here concerned.[3]

The "Armenians" of Eusebius seem to profess Christianity as a national religion: this links on the Christians of Sophene

[1] These satraps, although invested by the Roman Emperors, were none the less vassals of the King of Armenia. The latter possessed in the 4th century residences and fortresses on several points of the Roman satrapies (Gelzer, *Die Anfänge der armenischen Kirche* in the Transactions of the Leipzig Society of Sciences, 1895, p. 130, note 1).

[2] *H. E.* ix. 5. The Armenians, of whom Merouzanes, the correspondent of St Dionysius of Alexandria, was bishop (Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 46) must be looked for in the Provincial Armenia or Armenia Minor. On this subject see my memoir, "L'Arménie chrétienne dans l'histoire ecclésiastique d'Eusèbe" (*Mélanges Nicole*, Geneva, 1905). *Cf.* Vol. I., p. 338.

[3] *Cf.* Vol. II., p. 26, note 2, and the memoir quoted *supra*.

to those of Great Armenia. So far as the latter is concerned,[1] the abolition of paganism and its replacement by Christianity are attributed, by all Armenian tradition, to King Tiridates (261-317). Sozomen[2] knew the details of this event, but he speaks of it only with caution: "*It is said* that Tiridates, the chief of this nation, as the result of an extraordinary miracle[3] which took place in his house, became a Christian and enjoined all his subjects by a single edict also to practise this religion."

The Armenians tell the tale of it at much greater length; but their stories are very little credible. We are reduced, for these origins,[4] to a compilation in six books, of which the first two, attributed to a certain Agathangelus, exist in Armenian and Greek: they deal with the reign of Tiridates. The four others, which bear the name of Faustus of Byzantium, are only known to us in an Armenian text.[5] They carry the narrative down to the partition of Armenia at the end of the 4th century.

This "History of Armenia" has its starting-point in the conversion of King Tiridates by a Christian of Armenian race, but educated in Cappadocia, Gregory, styled, in virtue of the part he played, Gregory the Illuminator. This famous man, who belonged to one of the noblest families in the kingdom, had been at first persecuted by Tiridates and then recognized by him

[1] There is no need to take into account the legends relating to St Bartholomew and St Thaddeus. The first comes from Byzantine catalogues of the late 6th century or the century following: the other is only an Armenian adaptation of the famous legend of Edessa. All this is of foreign importation. The true current of tradition is that which goes back to St Gregory the Illuminator. Despite the fables which encumber it, it is the only one of which history could make use. However, it must be recognized that the connexion with Edessa seems to have been made fairly early. Faustus of Byzantium always describes the see of the Catholicos as "the throne of St Thaddeus."

[2] *H. E.* ii. 8. [3] Ἐκ τινος παραδόξου θεοσημείας.

[4] I disregard Moses of Chorene, a writer not of the 5th century, as was long believed, but of the 8th.

[5] Agathangelus and Faustus are to be found, in a French translation, in the first volume of the *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie*, by V. Langlois (Paris: Didot, 1867). On the origins of Christianity in Armenia, see H. Gelzer, *Die Anfänge der armenischen Kirche* in the "Transactions of the Royal Academy of Saxony," vol. xlvii. (1895), p. 109.

as a messenger of God, and commissioned to preside over the establishment and organization of Christianity as the national religion of Armenia. He was sent to Cæsarea, whence he brought back episcopal consecration: he set himself forthwith to instruct his fellow-countrymen, to baptize them and to found churches. The latter were, for the most part, established in places where the sanctuaries of the earlier religion had been in use. The Christian clergy recruited themselves, to a considerable extent, among the officiants of the pagan temples. The goods of the latter were assigned to the churches.

The story has come down to us in a form likely to cause great uneasiness. Fables have an amplitude in it which is very uncommon: what is more, the editor purports to be King Tiridates' own secretary. We are then in the presence of a forgery. However, this literary forgery and these monstrous legends rest upon certain topographical and even historical data which it would be imprudent to neglect. It has been noticed that the marvellous in its most incredible form is attached to the episode of the two virgin martyrs Hripsime and Gaiane and their thirty-two companions. These saints, victims of the persecution of Tiridates, had been martyred near Valarschapat. Three churches were erected in their honour. Later the residence of the Catholicos was established in this holy place, called Etchmiadzin, which thus became the centre of Armenian Christianity. It is natural that in such circumstances the legends of Etchmiadzin should have received a special development. Nevertheless, even after having eliminated everything which, in the narrative of Agathangelus, concerns Etchmiadzin directly or indirectly, there still remain enough fables, and, above all, enough historical blunders[1] to

[1] The Emperor Marcian († 457) is represented as a colleague of Diocletian; the war of the Goths as in the time of Diocletian, with the single combat of Tiridates and the King of the Goths; the reign of Licinius in the East placed before the persecution of Diocletian; the relics of St John Baptist and of St Athenogenes brought to Armenia from the beginning of the episcopate of St Gregory; the journey of Tiridates and of Gregory to Rome, where they meet Constantine and Archbishop Eusebius (*variant* Sylvester), though Gelzer has endeavoured to save it (*op. cit.* pp. 167-171), etc. The confusion in regard to Marcian proves that, at least in the Greek and Armenian recensions that we possess, the history of Agathangelus hardly goes back to the end of the 5th century. On the whole, however, it is well to put it earlier, for Lazarus of Pharbe, who wrote

make one scarcely tempted to draw from it much more than I have done.

However, it is possible to collect there some local memories, destructions of temples,[1] foundations of churches. The church of Aschdischad in the province of Taron, is highly extolled: it is, so it is said, the first, the mother of all the churches of Armenia. The fact is that this church, like that of Bagavan in the Bagrevan, was held in great veneration: both were, on certain days of the year, the scene of great religious and national festivals. Aschdischad had been in former days a holy place of paganism: the god Vahak'n, the Armenian Heracles, was honoured there, with his companions in worship Anahid and Astghig (Aphrodite).

Taken as a whole, the Armenian legend gives an impression identical with that which results from the short passage of Sozomen. Christianity was not introduced in Armenia, as it was in the Roman Empire, little by little, by way of individual conquests, successive foundations. The king made up his mind all at once to change the national religion: the conversion took place not only on his example but by his order. The people evidently count for nothing in it: the nobles alone are consulted and approve. The priests, naturally, offer resistance. It is necessary to reckon with their territorial power and their numerous retinue of temple servants. The king proceeds methodically, availing himself of the aid of the lay aristocracy to triumph over the priestly aristocracy, and the latter, for whom moreover certain compensations are provided in the new state of things, in the end resigns itself.

This official change can hardly have come about apart from certain necessities or opportunities of a political kind. Armenian nationality, protected by the Romans, had hardly been threatened except by the Persians. But the Persians, since the advent of the Sassanid dynasty, were seeking not less to propagate their Mazdæan religion than to extend their

towards the end of the 5th century, knew Agathangelus almost in the form in which he has come down to us.

[1] Apart from what is said of Etchmiadzin, the destruction of the temple of Dir, at Erazamoin; of Anahid, at Artaxata; of Parschimnia, at Thortan, in the district of Daranalis; of Aramazd, at Ani; of Anahid, at Erez (Acilicene); of Nanea, daughter of Aramazd, at Thil; of Mihr, at Pakaiaridj, in the district of Terdjan (Derxene).

Empire. In this respect their attitude bears a close resemblance to that of the Arabs in the 7th century. It is possible that the political chiefs of Armenia felt the need of opposing this formidable propaganda by a religious enthusiasm which the old divinities could scarcely inspire. At the moment[1] when this problem presented itself, Christianity was already very powerful in Asia Minor and Syria. The Roman state tolerated it, and it was easy to foresee that some day it would succeed the various forms of paganism which were still rivalling it in the Eastern provinces of the Empire. From the moment when the old Armenian cults were menaced by a religious propaganda which was subversive of nationality, it was good policy to replace them by a religion with stronger power of resistance, which had no compromising connexion with the national adversary, and on the contrary had fixed its roots in the Empire which was a friend and protector.

This official conversion led in the end to a Church which was frankly national. At the outset, it is needless to say, it was necessary to have recourse to neighbouring Churches in order to procure instructors, catechists. Some of these came from Roman Armenia, from Cappadocia and also from Syriac-speaking lands, from Edessa and from Nisibis.[2] As there was not yet an Armenian script, Greek and Syriac must have been employed in the Liturgy. It was only in the 5th century that Armenian characters were invented and that this language, which had hitherto remained an oral one, began to become literary. As for the religious organization it moulded itself from the beginning in the lines of the ancient cult. The temples, changed into churches, retained their territorial endowment, which was enormous: their ministers were transformed into clergy: the most dignified became bishops. At the head of this priestly body, Gregory, the initiator of the movement,

[1] The exact date is not known. Yet the conflict between Maximin and the Armenians seems to presuppose that the conversion of the latter already goes back to a fairly early date, before the annexation of Sophene in 297. Gelzer, *op. cit.*, p. 166, places the event in the neighbourhood of 280.

[2] It is possible that, even before Gregory, missionaries of Syriac speech had penetrated into the south of Armenia. The indications of this, and, in general, of Syrian intervention in the early days of the Armenian Church have been collected by Ervand Ter-Minassiantz in the first chapter of his study entitled *Die armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zu den syrischen Kirchen* ("Texte und Untersuchungen," vol. xxvi. 1904).

established himself in a kind of supreme pontificate which the Greeks described by the name *Catholicos*.

This dignity, in exactly the same way as the royal office, was considered as hereditary: there was a kind of patriarchal dynasty just as there was a royal dynasty. Gregory had children: his two sons Aristaces and Urthanes succeeded him one after the other. Aristaces was present in 325 at the Council of Nicæa. Urthanes placed one of his sons at the head of the Georgian Church; another, Jousik, succeeded him in Armenia. Later still we find his grandson Narses, and then the latter's son Sahag (Isaac) the Great. Such a system was not without sources of inconvenience. The Armenian clergy had been largely, too largely, endowed with the goods of the temples. The original recruiting among the former pagan priests had prolonged, under the Christian label, the existence of a caste, consecrated and powerful, and now arranged in a hierarchy around a chief of high lineage. This personage could not fail to enter into rivalry with the political chief, and the conflicts between them presented all the greater danger because among these mountaineers organized on a feudal basis the authority of the Prince, undermined besides by the intrigues of neighbouring states, could never be very strong. The Catholicos Jousik was assassinated by King Diran; Narses by King Pap.

One may well imagine that so rapid a conversion must have been very superficial. A barbarian people, whose religion was of a gross and sensual kind, could not have been led between one day and the next, I do not say to the ideal of the Gospel, but to the morality, relatively lofty, which was still observed among the Christian bodies of the Roman Orient. There were even in certain connexions efforts at resistance, protests, in favour of the ancient religion. The Catholicos Urthanes was attacked one day, in the church of Aschdischad, by a tumult of revolted pagans. The Queen, whom the bishop was accustomed to reprove from time to time for her conduct, gave them secret encouragement. King Diran (326-337) also in his turn drew upon himself the reproaches of the Catholicos Jousik, the son of Urthanes, to whom the disorders of the Court were a cause of scandal. One day he refused the King entrance to the church: Diran had him dragged from it himself, and caused him to be given a beating from which he died a few days later.

After the death of Jousik, his sons, who were devoted to the

pleasures of the world, refused the office of Catholicos. For some time the Church of Armenia was administered by one of St Gregory's fellow-workers, Daniel the Syrian. Then followed two archbishops, Pharen and Sahag (Isaac), who seem to have let things go and scarcely to have offered any opposition to abuses. Neither of them was a descendant of Gregory the Illuminator. Sahag, however, was of a priestly family, that of Bishop Albian, one of the first fellow-workers of Gregory.[1]

Gregory's posterity was not exhausted. The two sons of Jousik were dead, but from one of them, Athanakines, and a daughter of King Diran, was born a child named Narses, who was brought up at Cæsarea. Years passed by. The long period of hostilities between the Persians and the Romans, which began with the reign of Constantius, ended in the downfall of Julian. Sahag was at Antioch in the autumn of 363. He signed (Ἰσακόκις) with a number of other bishops the Consubstantialist profession of Faith addressed to the Emperor Jovian. Shortly afterwards the seat of the Catholicos became vacant: Narses, still a very young man, had returned to the Court of Armenia, where he occupied a position in the *entourage* of King Arsaces. The Armenian nobles acclaimed him as Patriarch. He was taken to Cæsarea, where Archbishop Eusebius occupied the episcopal throne. Basil was present at the ordination. The famous dove which one finds so often in these ceremonies appeared, so it was said, in the church and placed itself first on Basil and then on Narses. It was a sign. Narses, brought up in Cappadocia, had lived there in the observance of a form of Christianity more earnest than that of Armenia. He had seen there ascetics sober in dress, austere in morals: organizations for relief, hostels for the poor, the sick, and others, all the works of Eustathius and of Basil. He carried home with him, together with fruitful memories, a spirit hitherto unknown to his own land. The new religion of Armenia was scarcely anything but a kind of Anti-Mazdæism under Christian forms. Narses desired to communicate to his fellow-countrymen the true religion of

[1] This family, from which the Catholicos was readily chosen when the line of Gregory failed, was dominant in the region of the upper Euphrates (Mourad-Sou) at Manavazakert; that of Gregory at Aschdischad (near Mouch) a little lower down on the same river.

the Gospel, that which he had seen practised with fruitful results in the land of the Romans. A Council was held at Aschdischad and promulgated laws in the form of canons. The young Catholicos preached Reform everywhere. He set himself in particular to inculcate the indissolubility of marriage and to abolish certain funeral customs. The monks were favoured, the clergy exhorted to conform themselves to their mode of life. New bishoprics were founded as well as houses of reception for the poor, the sick, the lepers, as well as for the elimination of mendicity. At the same time schools were opened in which Greek and Syrian masters acted as teachers.

The zeal of Narses, seconded at first by public opinion, speedily brought upon him the enmity of the Court. He came into conflict with King Arsaces[1] who tried to set up in opposition to him a rival. When Arsaces in 367 had been taken prisoner by the Persians, Narses had a period of respite. The Emperor Valens was upholding in Armenia Pap,[2] son of Arsaces, to whom the Catholicos was for some time guardian. But Pap was not slow in freeing himself from control and behaved in such a way as to bring upon him the rebukes of the bishop. Narses paid the penalty for his frankness. He was invited to the king's table and there poisoned.[3]

His death was the signal for a reaction against his reforms. Not only were the customs condemned by Narses resumed, but the King went back upon Tiridates' acts of generosity towards the churches: he took away from them the largest part of their endowments. Encouraged by the attitude of the prince, the people erected once more here and there the altars of the ancient gods.

This change could not be agreeable to the authorities of the Empire. The metropolitan of Cæsarea protested against the assassination of the Catholicos. Down to that time the head of the Armenian Church had been regularly consecrated at Cæsarea. This custom dated back to its origin: it was at Cæsarea that St Gregory the Illuminator had received ordination. Once consecrated, the Catholicos himself used to ordain the other bishops. Since the death of Narses this power had been refused to him, and the Armenian bishops were obliged to come to secure consecration in Cappadocia. These relations,

[1] Faustus, iv. 13-15.

[2] The "Para" of Ammianus Marcellinus.

[3] Faustus, v. 24.

in regard to which our information is imperfect, were favoured by the imperial policy, which, ever since Jovian had been obliged to abandon the protectorate of Armenia, was setting itself to regain by means of intrigues the ground lost by the ill-starred expedition of Julian. Pap, the murderer of Narses, was Valens' man, a man little to be relied upon and one of whom the Emperor in the end got rid[1] in a fashion more oriental than honourable. In 373 we see St Basil receiving an official commission[2] to set in order the affairs of the Armenian Church. He went to Satala, a frontier town on the upper Lycus, where the Armenian bishops presented themselves before him. He addressed remonstrances to them on their passivity and urged them to show themselves for the future less indifferent in regard to matters in which the religious conscience is involved. One of them, Cyril, who was greatly disliked by the clergy of Satala, was subjected to an enquiry which turned in his favour. It would have been advisable to fill up the gaps which had come about in this episcopal body; but the Bishop of Nicopolis, Theodotus, who would have been able to supply persons suitable and speaking Armenian was for the moment estranged from the metropolitan of Cæsarea.[3] Owing to this incident Basil's mission failed in what was its essential purpose in the eyes of the Government.

The matter was taken in hand again by King Pap himself. He sent to Cæsarea a candidate for the episcopate, Faustus.[4] It was customary that the Armenian bishops should only be ordained upon the recommendation of their colleagues of Armenia Minor. Faustus presented no testimony on their part. Basil refused to consecrate him. Faustus then addressed himself to Anthimus, Bishop of Tyana, who was taking at this time the position of second metropolitan of Cappadocia. Anthimus consecrated him without demur.[5]

[1] Ammianus, xxx. 1.

[2] It is quite possible that the ascendancy of Basil over the Armenian Episcopate counted among the reasons which determined Valens to tolerate him in his see. See Vol. II., p. 322.

[3] *Ep.* 199.

[4] This Faustus must be different from the one whom a third Faustus, Faustus of Byzantium, mentions in his History in connexion with the election and death of St Narses (iv. 3; v. 24; *cf.* vi. 5, 6). However, with such historians all confusions are possible.

[5] Basil, *Epp.* 120-122.

The post that Pap was giving in this way to Faustus was precisely that in which Cyril had been confirmed by St Basil. It was an important post, perhaps that of Catholicos.[1]

After the death of Pap Armenia was tossed to and fro for a dozen years between the influence of Persia and the influence of Rome. In the midst of unceasing wars the national Church maintained itself as best it could. Its heads, Zaven, Sahag, Aschbourag, have left but a memory of a very faint kind. They belonged to the family of Albian. The family of Gregory was not, however, extinct. Narses had left a son, Sahag, who attained the office of Catholicos about the year 390 and played a very great part. When Armenia was partitioned, the holy places of Aschdischad and Etchmiadzin found themselves comprised within the Persian part, and in this naturally the Catholicos fixed his residence.[2] If he was not there already, he installed himself definitely at Etchmiadzin. All tie with Cæsarea was broken, and an effort was even made, by striking legends, to inculcate the idea that the primatial church had been founded by Jesus Christ in person.

The accession of Sahag the Great practically coincides with the division of the kingdom of Armenia. For a comparatively short time there were two kings, vassals in the one case of the Greek Empire, in the other of the Persian state. It seems likely that the political separation had at the very same time ecclesiastical results and that the bishoprics situated in the Armenia which was subject to Rome were withdrawn from the obedience of the Catholicos. The southernmost of them formed part, from the middle of the 5th century onwards, of the ecclesiastical province of Amida.[3] We possess less light upon the relations of those in the north, which seem to have been attached, not to the nearest province, that of Sebaste, but to that of Cæsarea.[4]

[1] However, Faustus of Byzantium does not speak either of Cyril or of Faustus (at any rate under these names). According to him Narses was replaced by Jousig, of the family of Albian, without the intervention of the Bishop of Cæsarea. It was then that the latter is represented as having forbidden to the Catholicos the consecration of his colleagues (v. 29).

[2] Faustus, vi. 1-4.

[3] This follows from the signatures of the Council of Chalcedon in 451.

[4] The Bishop of Theodosiopolis (Erzeroum) is, in the ancient Τακτικά, a direct suffragan of Cæsarea. It is a reminiscence of the ancient relations between the metropolitical see of Cappadocia and the young Church of Armenia.

In Persarmenia Sahag represented the national tradition, not only for religious matters but also from the dynastic point of view. The last descendant of St Gregory the Illuminator, he upheld to the end the rights of the Arsacids to rule over Armenia. At the same time that the last king, Ardaches, who was disliked by the Armenian nobles, was deposed by his suzerain, the King of Kings Bahrâm V. (420-438), Sahag also was deprived of the pontificate. In place of the king, Bahrâm nominated a *marzban* or governor. As for the Catholicos, the Armenian "satraps" replaced him by a certain Sourmag, who did not please them long. The King of Persia, at their request, gave him successors who were Syrians, at first Perkischo, then Samuel. The saintly Sahag survived his three successors; but, though entreated to do so, he was unwilling to ascend after them the throne of which he had been dispossessed.

Sahag, with the aid of Mesrob, a learned monk, rendered to his fellow-countrymen the most signal of services by forming for them an alphabet which made it possible at last to write the national language. Up to that time the Armenians in respect of books had been tributaries of the Greeks or the Syrians. They preached in Armenian, but all writings were in Greek or in Syriac. Under the influence of Mesrob and of Sahag a quantity of Greek or Syriac books were translated into Armenian, and the writers of this land began to write in their own language. This has contributed not a little to preserve the individuality of this people, so greatly threatened by dismemberment and absorption of a political kind.

The history of the pontificate of Sahag is fairly well known to us from the accounts of it given by three serious authors of the 5th century—Gorioun, author of a Life of St Mesrob, Elisha, and Lazarus, the historians of the Armenian insurrection in the time of Jazdgerd II. This last event is one of very great importance. From the time of the suppression of the Armenian kings down to the middle of the 5th century, the kings of Persia had respected the religious beliefs of the country and had abstained from propagating Mazdæism in it, still more from imposing its profession. Jazdgerd II.,[1] in the twelfth year of his reign (449-450), addressed an invitation to the leaders of the nation to embrace the cult of Ormuzd. We still possess

[1] Elisha, c. 2 (p. 190); Lazarus, 20-23 (p. 281).

this document, together with the reply made to it by the seventeen bishops of Armenia, the other leaders of the clergy, and the representatives of the aristocracy. The last, however, when summoned to Ctesiphon about Easter 450 yielded to the king's demand. They returned to Armenia with a body of 700 Magi who were to superintend the change of *cultus*. Everything was to be concluded within the space of one year. But at the call of the clergy the whole of Armenia rose in revolt. The Marzban himself was obliged to take the side of the insurgents. Even those who had weakened at the King's Court became the leaders of the Holy League. The Roman Emperor, though invited to intervene, remained neutral. Reduced to their own resources, the Armenians fought valiantly and gained some successes. In the end the numbers and superior discipline of the Persian army got the better of the insurrection. The Marzban Vasag had gone over once more to the Persians, and by his exertions there was organized in the land quite a party which was favourable, if not to the new cult, at any rate to outward submission. On its side the royal government recognized that it had taken a wrong course and once more adopted its tradition of toleration. Only the leaders were interfered with. A certain number of Armenian nobles who had been sent to the king underwent a long and harsh captivity. The clergy were still more severely treated. The Catholicos Joseph, Sahag Bishop of Reschdouni and some priests, one of whom named Leo enjoyed a quite peculiar popularity, were executed near Nischapour in Khorassan (July 25, 454). It is these who are called the Leontian Martyrs.

Peroz, the successor of Jazdgerd (457-484), restored their liberty to the "satraps" confined for their Faith and for insurrection (462-463). The Armenian Church had already reorganized itself, under the Catholicates of Melidas and of Moses, both of them natives of Manazgerd. After them the national pontificate was awarded to Kiud.

Pacified externally, Armenia did not cease to be troubled by religious strife. Employment and honours were granted only to apostates. Without being officially imposed, Mazdæism was spreading itself more and more by the magnetism of Government patronage. Naturally, patriots and zealous Christians did their utmost to counteract this movement.

Hence arose quarrels incessantly renewed. The Patriarch Kiud was, of course, the centre of the opposition. Denounced to the Court, he was summoned before the king and deprived. But the national party found other leaders in the family of the Mamigouni. This family, exceedingly influential and also deeply compromised in the previous wars or insurrections, found itself compelled to give pledges to the Court of Persia, even from the point of view of religion. In the twenty-fifth year of King Peroz (481-482), a revolt of the Iberians provided the Armenian patriots with a favourable opportunity. The eldest of the Mamigouni, Vahan, surnamed Vahan the Magus on account of his apostacy, put himself at the head of the movement. A military conspiracy broke out: the Marzban and the Persian commander had a narrow escape of capture. In several encounters the Persians were beaten by the insurgents. However, they succeeded in regaining the advantage, and the resistance took the form of a war of parties. Vahan prolonged it for a period of three years, during which he and his followers distinguished themselves by exploits worthy of the Maccabees.

Success crowned their efforts. In 484 the King of Persia was defeated in a decisive battle by the Ephtalite Turks in the outskirts of Merv. The Persian Government felt the need of pacifying Armenia. They came to terms with the insurgents. Vahan Mamigouni, summoned to the presence of the new King Balasch, was commissioned by him to govern Armenia with the title of Marzban. It was a great triumph for the Christian and patriotic party.

The Patriarch John Mantagouni, who had taken an important part in the movement of insurrection, had the joy of consecrating its happy ending by solemn Thanksgiving Services. The history of the two revolts of 450 and 481 was forthwith written by Lazarus of Pharbe and dedicated to the national hero Vahan Mamigouni.

3. *Persia.*[1]

About the year 333 the Emperor Constantine, writing to the King of Persia, Sapor II., commended to him the Christians

[1] J. Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'Empire perse sous la Dynastie sassanide* (Paris, 1904); *Synodicon Orientale*, ed. Chabot (Paris, 1902).

of this land: they were there, he said, in considerable numbers, in the principal districts.[1] He had learnt, adds Eusebius, that among the Persians there were many churches and Christians.[2] The fact is, moreover, established by the Homilies of Aphraates, "the wise Persian," a contemporary of Eusebius, and by the documents of Sapor's persecution.

The evangelization of the country must go back to a fairly early date. Tatian, like Aphraates, belonged to the land of Assyria or of Adiabene, which formed part of the Persian kingdom. In the 3rd century the Bardesanite dialogue, "The Laws of the Countries,"[3] reasons about the moral obligations of the Christians of Parthia, Media, Persia and even of Bactriana, in such a way as to justify the inference that the Gospel already had disciples in the furthest regions of the Persian Empire.

In regard to details we have only legends, each more improbable than the other. The fact which may be accepted as their residuum is that Christianity was imported chiefly from Edessa. In exceptional cases missionaries may have come from elsewhere, some even against their will, having been transferred to Persia as prisoners of war.[4] But Edessa, an ancient Christian centre of Syriac speech and Semitic culture, was the focus best situated for sending forth rays into the countries of the Tigris and the Euphrates. It is precisely in this way that things are represented in the legend of St Maris, which, in spite of the lack of certainty which it offers in details must rest, at bottom, on a tradition worthy of considerable respect.[5]

In Persia the Gospel came into collision with an official religion which was strongly organized, Iranian Mazdæism. The priests of this cult, who were attached in each village to the local Pyræum,[6] were governed by a kind of provincial bishop, the *Mobed*. The Mobeds (Magi) had a head, the

[1] Τούτῳ τῷ καταλόγῳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, λέγω δὴ τῶν Χριστιανῶν . . . τῆς Περσίδος τὰ κράτιστα ἐπὶ πλεῖστον, ὥσπερ ἔστι μοι βουλομένῳ, κεκόσμηται (Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, iv. 13).

[2] Πληθύειν τὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας, λαούς τε μυριάνδρους ταῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ποίμναις ἐναγελάζεσθαι (Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, iv. 8).

[3] Vol. I., p. 329. Eus., *Praeparatio Evangelica*, vi. 10, 46.

[4] Vol. I., p. 340.

[5] Edited by Abbeloos, *Analecta Bollandiana*, iv. p. 43.

[6] Temple of Fire.

Mobedan-mobed or Archimagus, one of the most important personages of the Persian State. In the western provinces, which were Aramæan in race and language, this hierarchy represented little more than a façade. Ormuzd had not dethroned the old divinities of Nineveh and of Babylon: their worshippers, it is true, were outside the ruling caste; they were treated as *rayahs*. Among them lived a numerous Jewish population, descendants in part of the great Captivity.

About the time when the Apostles began to preach the Gospel the Jews were so influential in Adiabene that they succeeded in converting King Izates, together with his mother Helena, and his brother Monobazus.[1] Adiabene was at that time a little frontier kingdom, a vassal of the King of Persia as that of Osrhoene was of the Roman Emperor.

But the real centre of the Jewish colonies was to be found towards the lower Euphrates, in the town of Nehardea. There were schools there from which issued the Babylonian Talmud. Jewish Christianity does not seem to have spread itself in these circles; yet in the early developments of the religion of the Mandaites there can be recognized Christian elements[2] which had filtered in, Heaven knows how, and had passed from it into Manicheism. It was certainly not from these roots that there sprang the Church of Persia.

At the moment when it becomes visible to history its organization, roughly similar to that of the Churches of the Empire, presents on the other hand some peculiar features. The communities are governed by a body of bishops, priests, and deacons, with which is incorporated the group of ascetics, men and women. All of them taken as a whole bear the title of "Sons of the Alliance." In general there was only one bishop in each place: sometimes, however, we find two of them; but it is an anomaly. Religious teaching is founded, as everywhere, upon the Bible: in the explanations given of it rabbinical traditions furnished elements analogous to those which the Greek commentators derive from their national philosophies. There was little speculation on dogma. The Christology developed by Aphraates has certainly not been influenced by the controversies relating to Sabellius, to Paul

[1] Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 2-4. Helena died at Jerusalem shortly before the war of Titus. Her tomb is still to be seen there.

[2] *Cf.* Vol. I., p. 409.

of Samosata, and to Arianism. However, they maintained relations with the episcopate of the Empire. A Persian bishop was present at the Council of Nicæa[1]: there was one of them also at the Dedication of the Holy Sepulchre in 335: he is even represented as a skilled theologian.[2]

The ecclesiastical language was Syriac, at any rate in the western provinces, the only ones from which any literary remains have come down to us. There is, however, nothing to hinder us from supposing that in the eastern districts, in Persia properly so-called, Hyrcania, Seistan, and the Oasis of Merv, the Liturgy was written and celebrated in Pehlvi or in another tongue.

The lines of administration in which the hierarchy of the Mobeds had been shaped, served also for the Christian communities. There were distinguished at an early date the ecclesiastical provinces of Adiabene (Nineveh, Arbela, Mosul), Garamæa (Kerkuk), Chaldæa (Seleucia - Ctesiphon), Mesene (Bassora), Susiana (Gundisapor), Persia (Rew - Ardaschir). A province of Nisibis, trophy of the victory of Sapor over Julian, was added from 363 onwards. Others were organized later. A very natural tendency led the Bishops of Seleucia-Ctesiphon to transform themselves into Patriarchs after the example of the Grand Mobed and the Armenian Catholicos. This result, however, was not achieved without conflicts.

Of these early days there remains a curious literary monument in the collection of the teachings of Aphraates[3] or Jacob, Bishop of the province of Adiabene, whose memory centred in the monastery of Mar-Mattai (St Matthew) to the north of Nineveh. These Teachings are dated with exactness, the first ten in the year 336-337, the others in 345. There were at first only twenty-two of them, corresponding to the letters of the Semitic alphabet; a twenty-third was added as a supplement. Aphraates treats in them of religious subjects of the most diverse kind: an important place is given to controversy against the Jews, a fact which agrees well with the special problems of the area.

[1] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, iii. 7: Ἰωάννης Περσίδος among the signatures.

[2] *Ibid.* iv. 43: τὰ θεῖα λόγια ἐξηκριβωκὼς ἀνήρ. The name is not given.

[3] Published with a Latin translation by Dom Parisot in Mgr. Graffin's *Patrol. Syriaca*, vol. i. (Paris, 1894): in a German translation by Bert in the *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. iii.

Between these two series of Teachings comes an event of very grave significance: the rupture of the Persian sovereign with his Christian subjects. Down to that time he had tolerated them. When Sapor II., while still in his mother's womb,[1] had been proclaimed king in 309, the Roman Empire was persecuting them. Now, not only did it show them favour in its own borders and tend to make of their religion a State Religion, but it posed as their protector in foreign countries. This was a grave matter, more especially as Sapor on arriving at manhood had set himself the task of recovering the provinces ceded in 297, and was preparing in consequence to break the peace. Since the last year of Constantine there had been occasional hostilities. Constantius had hardly been installed when war broke out with the celebrated siege of Nisibis, whose inhabitants, encouraged by their bishop James, did marvels and tired out the patience of the invader. The hostilities, with many vicissitudes of success and defeat, lasted on down to the downfall of Julian in 363. They began again even under Valens (373), and it was only with Theodosius that a settlement was achieved.

In this state of relations it was easy to represent the Christians as supporters of the foreigner. The Jews naturally regarded them with dislike: the Magi, whose cult they held in abhorrence, were not any more their well-wishers. Besides the Christians hardly disguised their Roman sympathies. Aphraates, in his Fifth Homily, which belongs to 337, speaks in terms scarcely veiled of the war which is in preparation, and has no hesitation in prophesying the success of Edom (Rome). He was doubtless not the only one to think and speak in this fashion. Thus we must not be too much surprised that, shortly after the opening of hostilities, the Christians should have been persecuted in Persia. A beginning was made in 340 by inflicting on them extraordinary burdens; then edicts enjoined the destruction of the churches and the confiscation of their property. At the same time an attack was made upon the clergy. Bishops, priests, and other clerks were arrested and taken to the royal residence at Ledan, in Susiana. The one of highest rank was Simon Barsabæus, Bishop of Seleucia-Ctesiphon. An effort was made, without

[1] The Magi placed the royal crown on the body of the pregnant queen.

success, to convert them to Mazdæism. A first massacre took place on Good Friday 341: in this Simon perished with several other bishops, a dozen priests of Seleucia, a hundred persons in all. In the following year it was the turn of his sisters, who were accused of magical practices against the sick Queen. They were cut in two and the Queen was made to pass between their bleeding limbs. At the same time there appeared an edict ordering the massacre of the Christians everywhere, without distinction between clergy and laity. These horrible orders were carried out with the refinements of Oriental cruelty. All private hatreds, all sanguinary instincts, were let loose. The Mazdæist clergy, who were to be found everywhere, showed the greatest zeal in the discovery and pursuit of Christians. It was in particular in the presence of the Prince, under the protection of the armed force which accompanied him in his movements from place to place, that the massacres were perpetrated. Even at the Court and in high offices there were victims.[1] Almost the entire population of the valley of the Tigris would have ended by succumbing to it if Sapor had not changed his mind and confined the proscription to the members of the clergy alone.

There were apostates but, so far as appears, many fewer than in the Roman persecutions. In many places Christian worship was suspended. The faithful of Seleucia made an effort to replace the martyr Bishop. A first successor, Schahdost, was elected; he was immediately arrested with 128 clergy or religious of both sexes, who were all of them executed; he himself was beheaded (342). A nephew of Simon, Barbaschemin, succeeded Schahdost; he too perished, together with sixteen clergy (346). It was necessary to abandon the effort to replace him: the episcopal see remained vacant for some twenty years. The other churches were not better treated.

This reign of terror lasted down to the death of Sapor II. in 379. When there was an opportunity for recollection and for reckoning up the victims, nearly 16,000 names could be recovered. Nor was this the whole: in the confusion of the butcheries an enormous number of martyrs escaped all reckoning. The survivors speedily set themselves to collect

[1] Usthazanes, Major-domo of the Palace; Pusaik, the Chief of the Workmen; Azad, a favourite eunuch (Sozomen, *H. E.* ii. 9, 11).

the memories of these terrible years. Lists[1] were formed, stories were drawn up, the various editions of which, here as elsewhere, received embellishments as they progressed. The most important of them speedily circulated beyond the Persian frontier. The Greek historian Sozomen, about the middle of the 5th century, draws upon them largely.[2]

In this bath of blood the Church of Persia continued to live. In truth, and to judge from the "Teachings" of Aphraates, it hardly perceived the calamities which were bursting upon it. Orientals are accustomed to being massacred. Aphraates groaned, but with self-restraint. An imperturbable moralist, he continued to preach amid the tempest, and his fellow-countrymen continued to furnish him with subjects for remonstrances.[3] The clergy abused their authority: they were harsh to the poor, practised usury, spent themselves in continual quarrels. The greatest defect in organization was the fact that there was not, in the land, any superior ecclesiastical authority. Strictly speaking, the bishop of the capital seemed indicated as the person to direct the others: the neighbourhood of the Court and of the high dignitaries of the Empire put him more than his colleagues in touch with the political power: the latter had a disposition to consider him as representing more especially the Christian communities of the realm, and as responsible in certain respects for their loyalty. But where exactly was the capital? The Court resided sometimes in Susiana, sometimes in Chaldæa. It was in this latter country at Ctesiphon, opposite to Seleucia, that it generally spent the winter. Ctesiphon was a royal town just as the Manchu city is at Pekin. The Court made full display there of its cumbrous pomp, its services, its military organization. On the other side of

[1] The most ancient is one which appears at the end of a very ancient Martyrology in the Syriac MS., Brit. Mus. Add. 12150, transcribed at Edessa in 412 (*Acta Sanctorum*, November, vol. ii., p. [lxiii.]).

[2] Sozomen, *H. E.* ii. 9-14; Assemani, *Acta Martyrum Orientalium*, vol. i. (Rome, 1748), in Syriac and Latin. The collection published by Assemani has been wrongly attributed to Marutas, Bishop of Maipherqat (c. 400). Another Syriac edition has been given by Bedjan, *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum*, vol. ii. (Leipzig, 1890). On the criticism of these documents see Labourt, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-55. *Cf.* G. Hoffmann, *Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer* (Leipzig, 1886).

[3] See especially Homily XIV.

the Tigris, on the right bank, at the confluence of the Royal Canal (Naharmalka) which linked it with the Euphrates, rose Seleucia (Beth-Ardaschir), a vast town, one of the great marts of the world. Seleucus, the lieutenant of Alexander, had founded it to succeed Babylon, which was declining: in its place, in the Middle Ages, there rose a little higher on the Tigris the very important town of Bagdad. It was in origin a Greek city like Antioch: from it came several men of letters. But from the time when the Parthians had been substituted there for the Seleucids this distant Hellenism began to dissolve itself in the Semitic surroundings: in the 3rd century, to judge from appearances, there were no longer there any but passing Greeks, drawn thither by commerce. Several times ravaged, even burnt by the armies of Trajan, Lucius Verus, Septimius Severus, Seleucia at the time when Christianity made its way into it found itself greatly fallen from its ancient splendour.

According to a tradition which has but little authority,[1] but is perhaps to be accepted in this, the Evangelizer, the first Bishop, was Maris, who had come from Edessa and who established in the oldest quarter of the town the most ancient church of the district, the church of Kokhe (Κώχη). This name seems to be the one which the place bore before Seleucus.[2] After these origins we hear mention of a Bishop Papa, who seems to have had serious difficulties alike with his colleagues, notably Miles the Bishop of Susa, and with his own clergy, instigated by one of its members, Simon Barsabæus. Papa would seem to have been deposed and Simon appointed in his stead; but the bishops of the Roman Empire, the "Western Fathers," when consulted in regard to this matter seem to have intervened, to have restored Papa and to have decided that only on his death should Simon exercise episcopal functions.[3] He exercised them, in fact, down to his martyrdom. In 344 Aphraates, in the name of an assembly of Bishops and other Christian leaders, addressed a long and severe admonition to a group in which figured the clergy of Seleucia-Ctesiphon. The latter was a prey to serious disorders.

[1] See Labourt's discussion, *op. cit.* p. 13.

[2] Just as at Alexandria the Racotis quarter preserved a name earlier than Alexander.

[3] On this affair see the *Synodicon Orientale*, ed. Chabot, pp. 289 ff.; Assemani, *Acta Mart. Orient.*, vol. i., p. 72; *cf.* Labourt, *op. cit.* p. 21.

When peace returned, on the accession of Sapor III. in 383, the churches of Persia re-organized themselves, and the question of primatial authority could be taken up once more. Happily, diplomatic relations having been renewed between the Emperors of the Theodosian family and the Persian sovereigns, it was possible also to re-establish from the side of the West ecclesiastical communications. Marutas,[1] Bishop of Maipherqat (Martyropolis in Mesopotamia beyond the Tigris), was several times added to imperial embassies and succeeded in creating a certain influence at the Persian Court and with the Episcopate of the kingdom. It was by his exertions, and in virtue of a royal summons, that there was held in 410 the Council of Seleucia.[2]

Marutas presented himself at it with a letter of the "Western Fathers," Porphyry of Antioch, Acacius of Berœa, and their colleagues of Edessa, Tella, and Amida. The Persian prelates took official cognizance of it. There were communicated to them also the creed and the canons of Nicæa; they accepted them and formulated a scheme of discipline in conformity alike with the Nicene ordinances and with local conditions. An effort was made before all else to strengthen the union between Christians of the same Church and to establish a real bond between the Churches themselves. The Council proclaimed the superior authority of the Bishop of the two royal towns (Mahoze, Madain = Seleucia-Ctesiphon) over the metropolitans of the provinces and over the bishoprics established outside the provincial organization. The metropolises were: Beit-Lapat (Gundesapour)[3] for Susiana; Nisibis, for the frontier province, added again to the Roman Empire; Prat[4] in Mesene, for the province of the lower river; Arbela, for Adiabene; Karka of Beit-Selok,[5] for Garamæa. The Bishops of Persia and of the more distant regions, whether in the interior or on the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean, were not yet grouped in metropolitical jurisdictions.

An effort at internal organization, with the assistance of the episcopal body of the neighbouring Empire, and above all with the benevolent support of the royal power—that is what is represented by the Council of Seleucia. The King of Kings,

[1] *Supra*, p. 62.

[2] *Synodicon Orientale*, ed. Chabot, p. 253.

[3] Sahabad, between Susa and Souster. [4] Bassora. [5] Kerkuk.

Jazdgerd I., had already given testimony of his good-will towards the Christians by the promulgation of a kind of edict of religious liberty and by causing the rebuilding of the churches destroyed during the persecution.[1] He received in audience the leaders of the Council, Isaac and Marutas, and by the medium of two very high officials, signified to the assembly that he ratified its resolution and would take steps to secure their application in practice.

It could have been wished that everyone had continued in the good intentions which had been displayed at the Council. Unhappily the old habits of indiscipline speedily regained the upper hand and the organization of the Patriarchate was not slow in being undermined afresh. The second successor of Isaac, Jahbalaha, had made as ambassador the journey to Constantinople in 417-8: two years later the Bishop of Amida, Acacius, arrived at Seleucia in the same capacity. It was agreed to hold a new Council (420), and this time the Church of Persia accepted a Byzantine code of a more comprehensive kind: it contained the canons of Ancyra, Neocæsarea, Gangra, Antioch, and Laodicea. Collections of this kind began to circulate in the Eastern Empire: they passed even into Latin countries. I do not know whether Acacius of Amida who carried them to Persia rendered a great service to the Church of that land. The majority of these canons had been dictated by circumstances of a local and transitory kind: they scarcely lent themselves to adaptation for general use.

Jazdgerd I. died in 420. During the last part of his reign mention is made of several executions of Christians. These, under the favourable conditions of religious peace, had multiplied in numbers. Conversions took place among the Mazdæist Persians, even among officials or dignitaries of State. Proselytism of this kind, which was greatly disliked at Court, was sure to raise difficulties. Others arose from the imprudent zeal of certain Christian priests who did not fail, as opportunity offered, to assail the national religion[2] and to

[1] He bore an excellent reputation at Constantinople. Socrates (*H. E.* vii. 8) represents him as extremely disposed to turn Christian: Procopius (*Bellum Pers.* i. 2) relates that Arcadius had entrusted to him, by will, the guardianship of his son Theodosius II. All this is of very small credibility.

[2] Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 38; Labourt, *op. cit.* pp. 105 ff.; Cf. *Analecta Boll.* xxviii., pp. 399-415 (Peeters).

overthrow the Pyræa. However, it seems very likely that under Jazdgerd repression was confined to particular cases. His son and successor, Bahram V., yielding to the suggestions of the Mobeds, let loose a general persecution and one of extreme cruelty.[1] Before the prospect of tortures of the most horrible character the Christians fell away in great numbers: others hid themselves: those who happened to be within reach of the frontier took refuge in the Roman Empire,[2] despite the guard which was kept on this side by the Arab tribes. The result of this was frontier incidents between the two empires. To the protests which came from Constantinople against the persecution of the Christians reply was made from Ctesiphon that the Magi of Cappadocia[3] were disturbed in the exercise of their worship. Complaint was also made that the Roman Empire, which had as great an interest as the King of Persia in the gates of the Caucasus remaining closed to the barbarians of the North, did nothing to aid in their defence. War broke out: it lasted for nearly two years, and was on the whole fairly successful for the Romans.[4] In the course of the operations 7000 Persian prisoners were delivered by the Bishop of Amida at the charge of his church. Acacius remained faithful to the good relations that he had entertained in the preceding years with the Persian Court. King Bahram desired to see him and once more he made the journey to Ctesiphon.

When peace was made with Theodosius II. in 422, the position of the Christians of Persia improved a little. Their bishops took advantage of it to revive the old quarrels: once more opposition raised itself against the Catholicos Dadiso. His adversaries interested in their cause some personages of the Court, and also, so it would seem, certain bishops of the Byzantine Empire.[5] Disgusted with these intrigues the

[1] Theodoret, *loc. cit.*, and *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*, ix. 9. *Cf.* Labourt, *op. cit.* pp. 112 ff.

[2] One of them, a certain Abraham, came as far as Auvergne. Sidonius Apollinaris had known him (*Ep.* vii. 17).

[3] *Cf.* Vol. I., p. 393. This was the time when Theodore of Mopsuestia was writing against the Magi of Persia; Theodoret himself too published a book of controversy with the Magi, Πρὸς τὰς πεύσεις τῶν Μάγων (*Ep.* 82).

[4] Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 18-21.

[5] Perhaps Acacius of Amida, who visited the Persian capital at the time of these differences.

Catholicos desired to retire from the world. He yielded, however, to the entreaties of his supporters who gathered themselves together and went to look for him in an Arab district, Maktaba of Tayyaye. There a council[1] was held which restored Dadiso, and decided that for the future religious matters should not be carried before the "Western Fathers," the latter having themselves laid down that no council ought to assemble itself against the Catholicos and that all the discussions ought to be terminated by him, in conjunction with his colleagues of the Persian kingdom. What St Peter had been in the Apostolic College, the Catholicos was in his body of bishops.

Thus was cut the bond, a very weak one, which, from a disciplinary point of view, attached the Persian Church to that of the Roman Empire, and more especially to the Patriarchal See of Antioch. It is possible that in thus accentuating its autonomy the episcopate of the kingdom of Persia thought to diminish the constant suspicions of the Government as to the co-religionists of the Romans. I believe, however, that it was inspired by the necessity of strengthening the local ecclesiastical organization which too frequent appeals to a distant authority could not have failed to compromise. It is the same feeling which had led the bishops of Africa to forbid appeals from their jurisdiction to that of the Holy See. It would have been happy if they had rested there, and if, under pretext of autonomy, they had not ended by breaking every connexion and by sacrificing the community of faith.

After Bahram V. his successors Jazdgerd II. (438-457) and Peroz (457-484) were also, at intervals, bigoted persecutors. Jazdgerd II., as we have seen above, endeavoured to convert Armenia to Mazdæism. He also persecuted the Jews: he was a Mazdæan of a very fanatical kind. In Persia also we find mention of martyrs,[2] John, Metropolitan of Beit-Selok, who was executed at Kerka in company with a great number of others, and in Media Pethion a renowned missionary. Under Peroz the Catholicos Babowai was thrown into prison, and spent two years there, at a time when the Persians were once more at war with the Romans. Set at liberty in 464, he administered his

[1] *Synodicon Orientale*, p. 285.

[2] Hoffmann, *Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer*, pp. 43-68: cf. *Anal. Boll.* vii., p. 5.

pontificate for some twenty years longer; but one day a correspondence was seized between him and the Emperor Zeno. Peroz caused him to be hung by his ring finger (484).

4. *Echoes of Christological Disputes.*

Neither the Armenian Church nor the Church of Persia took any direct part in the Christological disputes which agitated the Empire during the 5th century. No bishop of these countries figured at the Councils of Ephesus and of Chalcedon. As to the latter in particular, the Armenians, who were occupied in defending themselves against persecuting Mazdæism, were effectively hindered from attending. However, the religious divisions in the Byzantine Episcopate reverberated beyond the Eastern frontiers, and this reverberation had very grave consequences for the future of these far-off Christian communities. It was just in the Euphrates provinces of the Empire that the conflict of opinions was most acute. Acacius of Melitene and Rabbulas of Edessa had taken sides in it in favour of Cyril: a number of monks supported their views, and even exaggerated them. The Apollinarian[1] monks who had exclaimed so loudly against John of Antioch and who assailed Cyril himself were monks of Roman Armenia. In the contrary direction Theodoret, Andrew of Samosata, John of Germanicia, the School of the Persians at Edessa, with its head Ibas, who soon became a bishop, preserved a current of opinion favourable, not doubtless to the wild talk of Nestorius, but to the doctrinal tradition by which he had been influenced. We have seen[2] that about 438 the bishops of Persian Armenia had made themselves the exponents at Constantinople of the scruples excited by the theological opponents of Theodore of Mopsuestia.[3] It was from Iberia that there had come to Constantinople a man who was destined to be one of the leaders of the Monophysite party, Nabarnougi, who, under the name of Peter and the habit of a monk, lived in Palestine in the circle of Gerontius and of the Empress Eudocia, was ordained Bishop of Maiouma by Theodosius, the intruded Patriarch of Jerusalem, himself consecrated Timothy Aelurus

[1] *Supra*, p. 270. [2] *Supra*, p. 268 f.

[3] Two of them were in correspondence with Theodoret (*Epp.* 77, 78), but for quite a different matter.

at Alexandria, and always remained on the left wing of his party, so much so that it was impossible to induce him to agree to the Henotikon.

There were thus in the Armenian Church predispositions to Monophysitism. When this current was strengthened among its neighbours to the West, when the "Nestorian" bishops had been replaced by prelates of opposite tendency, when the School of the Persians at Edessa had been roughly handled and then closed, when finally the Henotikon, everywhere imposed, had been interpreted in a sense more and more unfavourable to the Council of Chalcedon, it is not surprising that this state of feeling should have propagated itself among the Armenians. In the period of material peace which followed the wars of Vahan, the Catholicos Babken, who succeeded John Mantagouni, held a great Council at Valarschapat in 491, and there, surrounded not only by his own bishops but also by those of Iberia and of Albania, solemnly pronounced the condemnation of the Tome of Leo and of the Council of Chalcedon.[1]

In so doing he was acting in accordance, if not with the text of the Henotikon, at anyrate with the sense which was more and more being attached to it in the Roman Orient. But when the wind changed, thirty years later, the Armenians did not follow the Byzantine Episcopate in its *volte-face*: hence came the schism which, since that time, separates it from the Orthodox Church.

If the Persian bishops, faithful to the spirit of Dadiso's Council, abstained from carrying their disputes before their colleagues in the West, and even from taking part in the dogmatic conflicts of the Byzantine Episcopate, they none the less maintained communication with their neighbours through the channel of the School of their nation, established at Edessa since the time, so it was said, of St Ephrem.

In the time of Ibas this School included a large number of teachers and students, all natives of the Persian kingdom. There the questions of the day were discussed, there people disputed for or against Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius.

[1] John the Catholicos (John VI.), a historian of the 10th century, p. 43 of the Armenian edition (Jerusalem, 1843), quoted by Gelzer in Hauck's *Encyclopädie*, vol. ii., p. 78.

The majority held for the teachers of Antioch and showed themselves very hostile to the Alexandrian theology. There was, however, an opposition among whom Cyril counted some weighty supporters, notably a certain Xenaias or Philoxenus, who later on played an important part. Among the others, in addition to Ibas himself, who became Bishop in 435, were to be found Barsumas,[1] Balai and Balasch, all three of them greatly disliked by the Monophysites. After the enquiry by Chereas in April 449[2] loud cries were raised for their expulsion. This same year Ibas having been removed from Edessa and replaced by Nonnus, they were, in fact, exiled, and not only they but many others besides.[3] On returning to their own country they attained to important ecclesiastical positions there: quite naturally they set themselves to accredit the views with which they were imbued and for which they had suffered persecution.

When the Henotikon appeared, Barsumas, who had become Metropolitan of Nisibis, provoked at the Council of Beit-Lapat in Susiana in 484 a doctrinal demonstration in the contrary sense. Two years later, at another Council, the Catholicos himself, Acacius the successor of Babowai, in his turn defined the belief of the Persian Church: "Our faith must be, as regards the Incarnation of Christ, in the confession of the Two Natures of the Divinity and the humanity. None of us must dare to introduce jumbling, commixtion or confusion between the diversities of these two natures. But, the Divinity remaining and persisting in its own properties and the humanity in its own, we reunite in a single majesty and a single adoration the diversities of the natures, because of the perfect and indissoluble cohesion of the Divinity with the humanity. And if anyone thinks or teaches others that passion or change is inherent in the Divinity of our Lord, and if he does not preserve in relation

[1] A very different person from the one who played a part at the second Council of Ephesus.

[2] *Supra*, p. 285.

[3] This expulsion is usually placed after the death of Ibas in 457. But his successor Nonnus showed himself faithful to the Council of Chalcedon, as is testified by his Synodal Letter of 458 (Mansi, *Conc.* vii., p. 552). It is more natural to place this event in 449 or 450, after the deposition of Ibas and not after his death. The letter of Simeon of Beth-Arsam (Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, i., pp. 204, 353) on these events is full of confusions.

to the unity of person of our Saviour the confession of a Perfect God and of a Perfect Man, let him be Anathema."[1]

Acacius had received his training, like Barsumas, at the School of Edessa. His Confession of Faith is derived from the theology of Antioch; between it and the Formula of Union in 433 or that of the Council of Chalcedon there are only shades of expression.

However, the term "Mother of God" was avoided. It will always be so, for in Persia people will always be hostile to what theologians call the *communicatio idiomatum*. When they shall make the distinction between Nature and Hypostasis, they will feel repugnance to the Hypostatic Union and will hold to the Personal Union. It is the old doctrine of Antioch which has remained outside the influences which in Greek Syria modified it in some points, and led it to recognize itself in the decree of Chalcedon.

Nestorius had very little prominence in this Syriac world. They attached themselves there more readily to Theodore of Mopsuestia, of whom they possessed many writings. It was only later that they restored the memory of the former Bishop of Constantinople. This entailed the rejection of the Councils of Ephesus and of Chalcedon. With the latter, strictly speaking, they could have come to terms from a doctrinal point of view: Nestorius quite recognized himself in Flavian and in Leo. Whether his estimate remained unknown, whether repugnance was felt at ratifying a condemnation which had put him on the same footing as Eutyches, or, in short, for some other reason, it remains a constant fact that the Council of Chalcedon was no more recognized than the Council of Ephesus in Persia. In fine, it is on the teaching of the school of Antioch at the time of Theodore of Mopsuestia that the doctrinal tradition of the Persian Church branches off. Of further developments and conflicts, even of that to which the name of Nestorius remains attached, it felt but very little effect.

This may be said of the Great Church, of that over which presided the Catholicos of Seleucia; but we must not suppose that it continued indefinitely to represent the whole of the Christian elements in the Kingdom of Persia. Monophysite propaganda was not slow in intervening, and it too obtained some notable successes.

[1] *Synodicon Orientale*, edited and translated by Chabot, p. 302.

Thus in the dominions of the King of Kings the Christians of Armenia no longer professed the same faith as those of the Aramæan territory. Even in the latter a doctrinal opposition was in course of formation against the metropolitical see of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, weakened already by the constant indiscipline of its suffragans. In the midst of these Christian discords the *tertius gaudens* ought to have been Ahura-Mazda: it was the moment for his *pyræa* to blaze in joy and security. Nothing of the sort, however, happened. Just as in the fourth century Christianity had conquered the Roman Empire despite the quarrels of the bishops, in the same way we see it at the moment that we have reached triumphing in Persia over similar obstacles, though rendered more formidable by official disfavour and by the resistance, a well-organized resistance, of the Mazdæan clergy. Islam alone arrested its progress.

5. *The Arabs and the Indians.*[1]

On the Aramæan populations of the valley of the Tigris and of the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire bordered the ethnic group of the Arab tribes, nomadic in the neighbourhood of the Euphrates and of Syria, attached to the soil at certain points, notably at the approaches of the Persian Gulf and in what was called Arabia Felix, in the southern angle of the Arabian peninsula. The nomads of the north lived, very poorly, on the fringe of the two great empires whose frontiers, in any case very imperfectly delimited, hardly existed for them. Those nearest to Persia early possessed a political centre in proximity to the Tigris, in the renowned fortress of Hatra.[2] Towards the middle of the 3rd century this place was swept away by Ardaschir or Sapor I.,[3] but another Arab metropolis was soon founded to the south of the Euphrates and of Babylon, Hira or Hirta of Naaman.[4] Less organized, the nomads of the west wandered about between the Euphrates and the Syrian towns, Berœa (Aleppo), Chalcis, Epiphania (Hamath),

[1] See my book *Églises séparées*, pp. 366 ff. *Cf.* the *Mélanges* of the École de Rome, vol. xvi., pp. 79 ff.

[2] El Hadr, to the S. W. of Mosul. [3] Nöldeke, *Tabari*, p. 33.

[4] Hira is the Arabic, Hirta the Syriac name. To Hira succeeded Koufa, in the time of the first Caliphs, then Nedjef or Meched-Ali, now one of the Holy Places of the Shiites.

Emesa, Palmyra, Bostra, Petra. Others moved about in the Sinai peninsula, between Petra and the Egyptian Isthmus.

These sons of the desert scarcely offered a hold for Christian preaching. However, as the result of straying over the frontiers of the Roman Empire they fell in with the Die-hards of Asceticism, whose manner of life made a strong impression upon them. Their fasts, their grim places of abode, their costume, might seem eccentric to dwellers in the Roman towns: they were exactly what was needed to excite the attention and the respect of the nomads. Hilarion († 371), who led a life of penance on the outskirts of Gaza, exercised much influence over them.[1] Sozomen[2] speaks of a Sheik Zokoum, of the same district, so it would seem. He had no children: a solitary obtained some for him by praying for him, on condition that he would be converted. He complied, together with his whole tribe.

A Queen of the Saracens, Maouvia, had for a long time been making war on the Romans. She ended by accepting peace and even conversion, but on condition that a bishop should be given to her tribe and that this bishop should be Moses, a solitary whom she held in high esteem. The Emperor Valens consented to this arrangement, and Moses was taken to Alexandria to be ordained by the Arian Bishop, Lucius. But the solitary protested: they had to find Catholic bishops for him and to go to look for them in places of exile.[3] It is probably this same Moses who, according to other accounts, converted an Arab tribe belonging to the Desert of Pharan together with its chief Obadian.[4] Such was the origin of the Bishopric of Pharan which carried on its work for some time in the Oasis of that name, at the foot of Serbal, and was later attached to the famous monastery of St Catherine.[5]

Other establishments of this kind were formed in Palestine and Eastern Phœnicia: that of *Parembolae*, to the east of

[1] St Jerome, *Vita Hilarionis*, 25.

[2] vi. 38. [3] Rufinus, *H. E.* ii. 6.

[4] Combéfis, *Illustrium martyrum triumphi*, pp. 99 ff.

[5] A monk called Nathyr was Bishop of Pharan about the beginning of the 5th century (*Vitae Patrum*, v. 10, § 36; Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, lxxiii., c. 918). He is, after Moses, the earliest that we know. Agapitus, the alleged Bishop of Sinai in the time of Licinius (Raymond Weil, *La Presqu'île du Sinai*, 1908, pp. 221, 258) is in reality a Bishop of Synaos in Phrygia.

Jerusalem, another in the outskirts of Damascus, whose bishops sat at the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. The Bishopric of *Parembolae* presents us with a special feature of interest. Its first holder was no other than the former Sheik. Before his conversion he was called Aspebaetos. His son, a paralytic, having been healed by St Euthymius, a monk on the outskirts of Jericho, Aspebaetos passed over to Christianity together with his tribe. The Patriarch of Jerusalem, Juvenal, baptized him by the name of Peter and consecrated him Bishop of the Saracens.[1] He played a part at the Council of Ephesus in 431.

These Arab bishoprics remained isolated from one another: they did not group themselves as a national Church, like those of Persia and Armenia: they even entered like the other Syrian bishoprics into the provincial organizations of the Byzantine Church.

To the south of this Roman Arabia there stretched, in the interior, the plateaus of the Nedjed and, near the Red Sea, the district of the Hedjaz. The Nedjed was touched by Christian preaching, but at a quite late date, not before the sixth century. As for the Hedjaz, it never heard it. On the other hand, Christianity reached, fairly early, populations much farther south, those of the high plateaus which command on east and west the outlet of the Red Sea into the Indian Ocean. On this side there was something quite different from nomad tribes. Two states were established there. On the Arabian side the port of Aden, famous from the most distant times, centralized in transit the commerce of the Mediterranean and of Egypt with the marts of India: in the valleys of the interior were cultivated products of great value. It was rich Arabia, fortunate Arabia (Felix), the modern Yemen. The princes of Saba in bygone days had defended their autonomy against Egypt and Assyria; severely handled sometimes by the Romans, they were in the end left to themselves. From the time of Cæsar and of Augustus their state bore the name of Kingdom of Himyar or Homer.

On the African side, the port of Adoulis, like that of Massaoua at the present day, allowed of communication with the mountaineers of Abyssinia. The latter belonged to the same ethnic sources as the neighbouring tribes, Gallas, Dankalis, Somalis; but they had been modified in the course of centuries

[1] Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Euthymii*, c. 18 ff.

by a strong Arab migration from the other side of the sea. Towards the end of the 1st century they formed themselves into an organized state of which the town of Axoum was the capital.

In religion the Axoumites and Homerites practised the old Sabean cult, a variety of Semitic polytheism. It was assailed quite early by a strong Jewish propaganda which came, so it seems, from the Israelite colonies in the interior which, by way of Teima, Khaiber, and Yathrib (Medina) staked out the way between Southern Syria and Arabia Felix. In the 4th century the Jews were very numerous in the Yemen.

It is not impossible that among them there may have been Jewish Christians. Thus would be explained the fact of that Hebrew Gospel which, according to a tradition of considerable antiquity,[1] Pantænus is represented as finding in the country of the "Indians." It was said that it had been brought there by the Apostle Bartholomew. But the "Indians" of Pantænus are very problematical people.[2] What seems more certain and more clear is that towards the middle of the 4th century the two countries of Saba and Axoum received missionaries who came from the Roman Empire.

For Axoum Rufinus tells the following story, drawn by him from a good source.

A philosopher named Metrodorus had visited these countries. Following his example another explorer, Meropus of Tyre, undertook the same journey, accompanied by two Christian children, Frumentius and Aedesius, whom he was educating. During a halt, doubtless at Adoulis, a quarrel arose between the natives and the members of the expedition: the latter were all massacred, Meropus perishing with them.

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 10; *cf.* Vol. I., p. 243, note 2.

[2] St Jerome (*De Viris*, 36; *Ep.* 70) adds definiteness to the indications of Eusebius. He knows that it was to the Brahmins that Pantænus' preaching was addressed, and that it was the Indians themselves who had asked Demetrius, Bishop of Alexandria, to send them missionaries. All this seems to be conjectural. There is no more reliance to be placed on the reports of Rufinus (*H. E.* i. 9), who sends St Matthew to Ethiopia and St Bartholomew to Nearer India. He designates Abyssinia by the name of Further India and places it between Nearer India and the land of the Parthians. There could not be greater confusion. See Vol. I., pp. 92, 243.

Only the two children escaped. Taken to the king and welcomed by him, they succeeded in gaining his favour with such effect that Frumentius became his secretary and Aedesius his cup-bearer. After the king's death the queen kept the two Tyrians to teach her son who was in his infancy. They profited by their position to promote the practice of religion among the Christian merchants whom commerce with the Empire led to sojourn in the land. They themselves set the example of piety: from this time some churches were built. On the young prince's majority they obtained permission to return to their own country. Aedesius became a priest at Tyre and himself gave Rufinus an account of his adventures. As for Frumentius he went to Alexandria, told Bishop Athanasius what had taken place, and urged him to send a bishop to a land so well prepared to receive the Gospel. Athanasius deemed that no one was more suitable than Frumentius to fill this office. He ordained him bishop and sent him back to Abyssinia where his ministry met with the greatest success.[1]

A little later the Emperor Constantius had business with the kings of these distant lands. He chose as his envoy the celebrated Theophilus the Indian or Blemmyan, who had long been living at the Court of Antioch with a great reputation for asceticism and the working of miracles.[2] He was an Arian and one of the most irreconcilable kind. Perhaps the mission of Frumentius had attracted his attention and aroused in him feelings of anxiety. Whether he spoke of this to the Emperor or the Emperor had found out for himself that a missionary sent by Athanasius could not be otherwise than dangerous, the fact is that Constantius wrote in 356 to the princes of Axoum, Aizan and Sazan.[3] They were asked to despatch Frumentius without delay to Alexandria; for as he derived his consecration from Athanasius it was to be feared that he shared the "errors"

[1] The ordination of Frumentius must be placed either shortly before 339 or shortly after 346, for between these two dates Athanasius was absent from Egypt. Rufinus is a little mixed in the chronology: cf. *Églises séparées*, p. 311, note 1.

[2] Vol. II., p. 222.

[3] The text is preserved by Athanasius (*Apol. ad Constantium*, 31). A Greek inscription (*Corpus Inscript. Graec.* 5128), in the name of Aizan as sole king, mentions his two brothers Saiazan and Adefas. We see in it that Aizan was a pagan: however, the letter of Constantius seems to assume that the two princes to whom it was addressed were already converted.

of that prelate who had been at this time condemned and deposed from the episcopate. The new Bishop of Alexandria would put the Pastor of the Abyssinians in the right path.

It was doubtless Theophilus who carried this document to its destination. Philostorgius,[1] who tells us about his embassy, relates that he went to the Axoumites, without entering into detail as to what he did among them. Among the Homerites he shows him in communication with the prince of the country whom he made an effort to convert; but he encountered strong opposition on the part of the Jews. He secured, however, and this was one of the objects of his mission, that Roman merchants who might travel in these countries and natives who might wish to be converted should have liberty to build churches. The king himself caused three of them to be erected, one at Safar his capital, another at Aden, the third at Ormuz at the entrance of the Persian Gulf.[2] This implies that there were already Christians in these distant countries. There were some at an even greater distance. Theophilus took advantage of his journey in the south of Arabia to revisit his native land, the island of Divou, which seems clearly to have been either Ceylon or some small island near to the Indian coast.[3] He found Christians there, in the same way as at other points that he visited on the same opportunity.[4]

Thus from the time of the Emperor Constantius there were churches on the coast of Hindustan. Cosmas Indicopleustes

[1] iii. 4-6.

[2] This is very difficult to believe, for it does not seem that the Homerite state extended so far. Philostorgius gets mixed in the geography. He places to the east of the Axoumites, on the shore of the Indian Ocean, a colony of "Syrians," established there by Alexander, and still preserving the Syriac language. Perhaps he means to speak of Ormuz, in this position still.

[3] Ceylon was called, in the language of the country, *Sinhala dvipa* (Island of Lions). Dvipa (Διβοῦ) is the word which means Island; we find this root again in the name of Diu, of the Laquedives, the Maldives, Serendiv—an Arabic name of Ceylon. The designation Διβοῦ has not then any definiteness; but as it corresponds to an Indian term, there is reason to believe that it refers to a place belonging to the Indian Sea and not to the Red Sea.

[4] Philostorgius says that he reformed various customs there—in particular, that of remaining seated during the reading of the Gospel. As for the Faith, he would not have found anything to correct: the Indians were Anomœans as determined as himself.

found them there once more in the 6th century: they were then attached to the Church of Persia, of which they were colonies. Several of the islands of the Persian Gulf, and even certain places on the adjacent mainland, had from the beginning of the 5th century Christian settlements and bishops. Cosmas found some as far as the island of Dioscorida (Socotora).[1] Without attaching too much importance to it, it may be noted that the legend of St Thomas makes the Apostle travel in Western India, in the India of the Indus, and that it contains data which imply in its editor a certain knowledge of this distant land and of its history in the 1st century of our era.

After the mission of Frumentius and the journey of Theophilus, darkness comes over the Christian settlements of Arabia, Abyssinia, and the Indies. It is only in the 6th century that they come to light again.

To the south of Egypt the Blemmyes and the Nobads maintained themselves in a state of hostility against the Empire and gave too much occupation to the guardians of the frontier for Christian missionaries to have been able to find access to them. Egypt had religious communications above the first cataract; but they were of a pagan kind. The Blemmyes, who were strongly attached to the cult of Isis, exacted the maintenance of the Temple of Philæ. Each year they were to be seen arriving at a fixed period: there was delivered to them the statue of the goddess: they carried it home and brought it back some months later. This body of adherents prolonged, for two centuries after Constantine, the cult of the ancient divinity of Egypt.

[1] Cosmas, Book III. (Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, lxxxviii., c. 170).

CHAPTER XIV

THE WEST IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

WHILST the Eastern Empire, taking advantage of comparative security, was indulging a passion for theological disputes, in the West the Church was in close conflict with the barbarians.

Into the imperial palace at Ravenna, which had witnessed the long minority of Honorius, Galla Placidia re-entered from Constantinople in 425 with an emperor of six years old. Empress herself, she at once undertook, in her own name and in the name of her son Valentinian III., the direction of affairs. They were going very badly. In Gaul, in Spain, in the Danubian provinces, in Africa, the barbarians were dominant or about to be dominant everywhere. Of Britain no more was heard. The Huns, established in Pannonia, were strengthening there the kind of supremacy which they had succeeded in exercising not only over the other barbarians, Finns, Slavs, Germans, but over the Empire itself, which had become their tributary. It was not a woman's hand that at such a moment would have been needed at the helm. The men who surrounded the Regent, men like Felix, Aetius, Boniface, spent their time in intriguing one against the other, in thwarting, in extinguishing one another. Aetius succeeded in a very short time in ridding himself of his rivals, Felix in 430 and Boniface in 432, and forced himself forthwith upon Placidia. For some twenty years it was he who was the master. He was a man of resource: he knew the barbarians, especially the Huns, through having lived among them; he knew how to deal with them and at need how to beat them.

Alone of the whole of the West, Italy had not yet made the acquaintance of barbarians settled in it. Everywhere else the successors of the dying Empire were already in possession, some of them in a regular manner and as the result of treaties, others by the sole fact of conquest. Already

under Honorius (419) the Goths, on their return from Spain, had seen allotted to them the whole of maritime Aquitaine from the Loire to the Pyrenees; their King resided at Toulouse, whence his eager desires were directed towards Narbonne and Arles. A short time before the Burgonds or Burgundians had received (413) a settlement on the left bank of the Rhine, in the neighbourhood of Worms and of Spires. As for the Franks whose thrust had for centuries been making itself felt on the lower course of the Rhine, it had been necessary to abandon to them Batavia (Holland), Toxandria (Brabant), and even regions further south. After the great invasion of 407 we see them making themselves masters of Cologne and, further west, advancing as far as Cambrai, Tournai, Arras, and at last as far as the Somme. In Spain, Suevi and Vandals, after having well ravaged the land, had ended by assigning to themselves, the one the western regions (Galicia and Lusitania), the others the south (Bætica), where their name has remained (Andalusia). The Vandals for the most part crossed to Africa (429) and made themselves its masters.

We see what subjects remained to the unhappy Empire, beyond the Alps and the sea. Moreover, they were not always obedient subjects. Menaced on the one side by the Franks, on the other by the Goths, the cities between the Loire and the Somme, the Armoricans as they were called, had ended by sending home the Roman governors and organizing themselves as a confederacy. Everywhere in Gaul and in Spain were to be met camps of Bagaudæ, that is to say of insurgents, of outlaws; here there collected in crowds the victims of the Roman Treasury, more pitiless than ever; with them were outcasts of every kind, people who had no longer anything to lose and who, since the world was dividing itself into pillaged and pillagers, preferred to belong to the latter category.

Aetius, so long as he lived, introduced a little order into the *débâcle*. The Franks were rolled back towards the north: the Burgundians who had given grounds for complaint were exterminated or thrown back beyond the Rhine.[1] A little later the Patrician established the last remnants of this people in Savoy (435). Aided by a body of Alan auxiliaries,

[1] It is the theme of the legend of the Niebelungs.

he repressed with severity the Armorican insurrection. As for the Goths, whom he knew how to keep at a distance from Narbonne, he employed them against the Suevi and even against the Bagaudæ. The last Roman general was the common hope. From Spain, even from Britain, there came to him final appeals. When in 451 Attila made up his mind to throw his hordes upon the Roman Empire, it was Aetius who, grouping round him in conjunction with the remnant of the imperial army the forces of the Goths of Aquitaine and even some Frankish contingents, compelled him to raise the siege of Orleans and inflicted on him in Champagne a memorable defeat.

One can easily imagine what would be at such a time the position of the churches. In the north of Gaul, where the Franks were rampant, Christianity had scarcely penetrated except among the population of the towns. When these disappeared in massacre and conflagration, Christianity was abolished together with all the elements of Roman life. When tranquillity returned, re-establishment was not always possible: in this way some churches sustained an interruption of longer or shorter duration.[1] Elsewhere calamities had to be faced without end and without cessation, captives had to be redeemed, miseries innumerable to be assuaged, offices to be reconstituted, places of worship rebuilt. The bishops set themselves to do it. It was upon them too that there had devolved the task of intervening, so far as it was possible to do so, with the barbarian chiefs or even of imploring the aid of the Roman commanders. Peril and common misery brought the clergy nearer to the faithful: the latter felt more than ever the necessity of having as bishops men of intellect and of sympathy. They asked for them in many cases from the monasteries which, since the time of St Martin, were being

[1] This was doubtless the case of Cologne, which, about the beginning of the 5th century (it does not appear in the *Notitia Dignitatum*), ceased to belong to the Empire in order to become the capital of a Frankish kingdom; and of Tongres, the bishopric of which when it re-appeared, about the end of the 5th or the beginning of the 6th century, was transferred to Maestricht; the Bishoprics of Tournai, Cambrai, Arras, Thérouanne, Boulogne (if there was one in this city) were equally disorganized. At Trèves, although this town had been four times taken and pillaged before being finally occupied, we do not find any interruption in the succession of bishops.

established almost everywhere. At other times—as in the case of the celebrated St Germanus of Auxerre, of St Paulinus of Nola, of Sidonius Apollinaris and many others—their choice fell upon former officials whose merit they had been able to appreciate during their secular administration.

This, then, was the general position, more or less difficult according to places and circumstances: it remained the same so long as the Western Empire lasted and even afterwards, until the states formed out of its débris had achieved a position of some stability. A few facts only, apart from the miseries of the invasion, can be mentioned here.

1. *Spain and Priscillianism.*

Despite episcopal condemnations, Priscillianism maintained itself in Spain, especially in Galicia. When the Roman officials were no longer there to overawe the heretics, they raised their heads again, renewed their propaganda, and circulated vigorously the Acts, full of marvels but apocryphal and doctrinally suspect, of the Apostles Andrew, John, Thomas, and others. This literature greatly disturbed the orthodox bishops; they knew, moreover, whether from the avowals of the Priscillianists themselves[1] or otherwise, that the sect was maintaining itself around them, and even that some of their colleagues were showing it covert favour. At bottom the situation had changed little since the Council of Toledo and the year 400.[2] But how were counter measures to be taken? In these disastrous times it was impossible to think of holding a Council. Besides, was it certain that, if the Episcopate of Galicia did assemble, the majority would be for repression? Turribius, Bishop of Astorga, with two of his colleagues, Hydatius and Ceponius,[3] were greatly concerned with this position. In default of support in their own province they invoked the authority of the Metropolitan of Lusitania, Antoninus of Emerita. It was in this town that the Suevic King Rechila was at that time living. He was a pagan, but his son Rechiar who was to succeed him (448) was a Catholic.

[1] *Chronicle* of Hydatius, c. 130, *cf.* c. 138.

[2] Vol. II., p. 430.

[3] Letter of Turribius to these two bishops, among the letters of St Leo, after Letter xv. (Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, liv., p. 693).

The Bishop of Emerita was likely to have some influence at the barbarian court. Meanwhile they heard of an energetic action of Pope Leo against the Manicheans of Rome (444). The idea came to Turribius of securing the intervention of the Apostolic See in the analogous affairs which were a source of anxiety in Spain. And it was an idea all the more natural because already the Popes had several times devoted attention to Priscillianism. Turribius wrote to Leo and informed him of the melancholy condition of the Galician churches. To his letter was appended a summary of the Priscillianist heresy set out in sixteen propositions.

Leo replied by a long letter[1] in which he praises the zeal of Turribius, censures Priscillianism, and refutes one by one the sixteen propositions. He would have desired the holding of a great Council in which might have been gathered the bishops of Tarraconensis, Carthaginensis, Lusitania and Galicia, at any rate of the last if it were impossible to secure a fuller meeting. Turribius and his friends Hydatius and Ceponius were commissioned to summon the Galicians. As a matter of fact no council was held. They confined themselves to collecting signatures. Turribius drew up an orthodox formula[2] which he sent, together with the Pope's letter, to all the bishops of Spain. All signed it, but according to the chronicler Hydatius some Galician bishops kept reservations up their sleeves.[3]

This Hydatius was Bishop of *Aquae Flaviae*,[4] a see subsequently suppressed. He has left us an interesting chronicle, especially in regard to the events which took place around him: like Prosper he tacked his work on to that of

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 412, July 21, 447.

[2] Mansi, *Conc.* iii., p. 1002. The title which relates this document to the Council of 400 is faulty in doing so. Dom. G. Morin (*Revue Bénédictine*, x. (1893), p. 386) conjectures, with much probability, that it was drawn up by a Galician bishop named Pastor, who is mentioned by Hydatius in his *Chronicle* (c. 102) and by Gennadius in his *De Viris*, c. 77. Pastor had been elected bishop in 433 in the *conventus* of Lugo, at the same time as a certain Syagrius (Gennadius, *op. cit.* c. 66: Morin, *loc. cit.*), in spite of the Bishop of Lugo, Agrestius. The latter's opposition arose probably from the fact that he was favourable to the Priscillianists.

[3] "Ab aliquibus Gallaecis subdolo probatur arbitrio" (c. 135).

[4] Chaves, in the Portuguese province of Traz-oz-montes, near the present frontier of Spanish Galicia.

St Jerome. In his childhood he had made the journey to the Holy Places: he could remember Jerome, Eulogius, John of Jerusalem, Theophilus of Alexandria. On becoming a bishop in 427 he found himself mixed up in events of the most mournful kind, the miseries of the barbarian occupation, the constant wars of the Suevi whether among themselves or against the Romans, the Goths, the Herulian pirates. He took part in 431 in a mission sent to the Patrician Aetius by the Roman cities of his province. In 461 the Suevic King Frumarius caused him to be arrested in his church and did not release him till three months later. It was only in 468 that he ceased to write. The Suevi among whom he lived seem to have remained pagans down to the death of King Rechila; his son Rechiar was the first Catholic king. But soon the religious influence of the Goths, represented in the country by a certain Ajax, a native of Galatia and a dignitary of the Arian sect,[1] made itself felt in a manner to cause disquiet. It was only in the following century that the Suevic conquerors succeeded in assimilating themselves, in religion, to the Hispano-Roman populations of Galicia.

In the upper valley of the Ebro the Bishop of Calahorra, Silvanus, distinguished himself by his zeal; this isolated region had had up to that time few bishoprics: he set himself to found others, without worrying himself too much about his metropolitan, the Bishop of Tarragona. From this arose a conflict which reverberated as far as Rome.[2]

2. *Gaul in the Last Days of the Romans.*

The region of the Rhône in Roman Gaul escaped longer than the rest from the calamities of invasion. Arles had assumed in it the position of a capital. The Prætorian Prefecture had

[1] "Aiax, natione Galata, effectus apostata et senior Arrianus inter Suevos regis sui auxilio hostis catholicae fidei et divinae Trinitatis emergit. A Gallicana Gothorum habitatione hoc pestiferum inimici hominis virus advectum" (Hydatius, *Chron.* 232).

[2] From the letters relating to this business it appears that bishops were installed at that time at *Cascantum* (Cascante), *Varela* (Logroño), *Tritium* (Tricio), *Libia* (Leiva), *Virovesca* (Briviesca). Jaffé, *Regesta*, 561; Thiel, *Epp. Pont.*, p. 165, *cf.* p. 156. It was perhaps at that time that there was founded the see of *Auca*, which does not appear in the documents till 589 onwards and which was later replaced by that of Burgos.

been transferred thither from Trèves with all the great administrative offices: it was the meeting place of the assembly of the Seven Provinces. To it there converged all that remained of Roman life in Gaul and in Spain. To this great political position they would greatly have liked to add a religious pre-eminence. The Vice-Emperor Constantius and his favourite Patroclus[1] had sought under Pope Zosimus to make the Bishop of Arles a kind of lieutenant-general of the Roman Pontiff for the Transalpine regions. Their efforts did not come to anything. After the death of Zosimus and especially after that of Constantius (September 2, 421), Patroclus saw his hasty constructions collapse. However, there remained something as a result. If the Bishop of Arles had not sufficient traditional standing to sustain the rôle which they had dreamed of making him take, he was on the other hand in a position to exercise a weighty authority in the district adjoining his episcopal city. The Pontifical Vicariate did not prosper, but Arles became an ecclesiastical metropolis of great importance. Under Honoratus and Hilary, the successors of Patroclus, its authority extended over the whole of the Viennensis, over Narbonensis Secunda and the Alpine provinces: it was the jurisdiction which had been established for Patroclus, minus, however, Narbonensis Prima.[2]

Patroclus had been killed in 426 in a political conflict.[3] He was replaced by the founder of Lérins, the venerable priest Honoratus. With him had come to Arles a young monk related to him, Hilary, who had been snatched by him, not without difficulty, from the life of the world, and was already in great repute in the holy island. He was a man of considerable culture and of virtue so exemplary that the people of Arles, among whom Honoratus only lived two years, appointed him

[1] *Supra*, p. 160.

[2] Further, the Bishopric of Uzès, a place included in the city of Nîmes and in consequence in Narbonensis Prima, was attached to the Province of Arles.

[3] *Chronicle* of Prosper. His death was imputed to the *Magister Militum*, Felix, who already had on his conscience the massacre of a Roman deacon named Titus. Felix (*supra*, p. 401), despite his attacks against members of the clergy, ranks among the number of benefactors of the Roman Church: an inscription (De Rossi, *Inscr. Christ.* ii. p. 149) mentions repairs which, in conjunction with his wife Padusia, he caused to be executed to the Lateran Basilica.

successor.[1] These saintly men caused Patroclus to be forgotten: the Bishop's house at Arles became with them a place of great edification. There might be seen the illustrious Hilary, anxious to spare the treasure of the Church and the patrimony of the poor, spending on the work of his hands the leisure hours of his pastoral ministry, knitting while he read or dictated his letters, in case of need tilling the earth. He preached much and long, too long even for the taste of light-minded parishioners who were to be seen sometimes discreetly slipping out at the moment when he was ascending the pulpit. He was often to be met with on the roads, and very far from Arles, always on foot, which did not hinder him from arriving before the rest. He kept his suffragans in activity by frequent meetings in Council: of some of these we still possess documents.[2]

As he attached great importance to good recruiting of the episcopal body, he was to be seen arriving everywhere that a vacancy took place. The intriguing and the ambitious dreaded this appearance; it was not in their favour that he directed suffrages. When he had found his man he ordained him, in virtue of his rights as metropolitan, and if efforts at resistance were made, the authorities at Arles had to be reckoned with, and these Hilary held in his hand. In Gaul as in the Orient saintly ascetics were somewhat liable in their search for the Absolute Good to overstep positive rules, to sacrifice tradition to perfection. Hilary had the mortification of dashing himself against obstacles which a more deliberate zeal would not have failed to foresee.

Since the time of Patroclus the clergy of Southern Gaul had grown familiar with the road to Rome. They readily carried thither their disputes and their complaints. Under Pope Boniface had been seen in Rome the clergy of Valence and of Lodève,[3] the former strongly incensed against their Bishop Maximus, whom they accused of Manicheism and of many

[1] *Supra*, p. 194.

[2] Councils of Riez (439), of Orange (441), of Vaison (442). Of the signatures appended in these Councils there have only been preserved the names of the bishops without indication of see. This lacuna has been supplied by a Cologne MS. of the 7th century, following which Maassen (*Geschichte der Quellen und der Litteratur des canonischen Rechts*, Gratz, 1870, p. 951) has published the signatures of Orange and of Vaison. See my *Fastes Episcopaux* (2nd edit.), i., p. 367.

[3] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 349, 362.

other things: the others, irritated against Patroclus who had interfered in order to give them a bishop, although, according to them, their church depended upon Narbonne and not upon Arles. Boniface decided in their favour, in both cases. Honoratus had hardly been installed when people wrote to Pope Celestine to denounce to him all sorts of abuses, real or alleged. Bishops were being chosen, not among the clergy of the church to be provided but apart from it, in the monasteries; those elected were maintaining in their new dignity the forms of their ascetic life; they were to be seen clad in mantles fastened with a clasp (*pallia*) and with their tunics held in by a girdle.[1] Penitence was being denied to the sick in danger of death; finally, with this mania for taking strangers as bishops, very bad mistakes were sometimes being made. A certain Daniel who came from the Orient, where he had left a bad reputation, had succeeded in evading the police while causing himself to be elected bishop. Finally it was said that the Bishop of Marseilles (Proculus?) had received with too little disguised satisfaction the news of the assassination of Patroclus. On these denunciations, which have every appearance of being the work of the supporters of Patroclus, Pope Celestine sent to the bishops "of Viennensis and of Narbonensis" a rating of the most vigorous kind.[2] Three years later he wrote[3] again, to Venerius of Marseilles and to various other bishops of the region, at the instigation of the two monks Prosper and Hilary, who considered that the priests preached too much in Provence and that they had not enough zeal for the views of St Augustine.

From all these reports, all these remonstrances, nothing serious happened. It was otherwise when, in 445, Pope Leo was put in possession of very lively complaints against the proceedings of Hilary of Arles. It had befallen the saint that he had appointed a successor to a bishop who was not dead but only ill, and who by recovering caused great embarrassment. At Besançon, very far from his province, Hilary had, in concert

[1] In place of the flowing tunic and the planeta, the costume generally in use. See *Origines du Culte chrétien* (4th edit.), p. 386.

[2] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 369, "Cuperemus quidem," July 26, 428.

[3] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 381; *supra*, p. 196. In this letter there is mention of a reply made by the Pope *ad fratris Tuentii scripta.* This reply is perhaps identical with the letter *Cuperemus quidem* (supra). As for Tuentius he is doubtless the same person as he who, under Pope Zosimus, was very badly handled by Patroclus (*Fastes Episc.* i. 100 ff.).

with St Germanus of Auxerre, whom he used from time to time to visit, collected a Council and deposed the bishop, Chelidonius, against whom certain disqualifications[1] were being urged. Chelidonius went to Rome and submitted to the Pope the sentence of Hilary and his Council. He met with a warm reception. It was winter. Hilary set out from Arles on foot, crossed the Alps amid ice and snow, and on his arrival in Rome set himself to protest against the readiness with which without any examination they had admitted to communion a bishop regularly deposed. He even seems to have disputed to the Holy See the right of revising cases already settled by Gallican Councils. In any case he expressed himself with a liveliness as likely as possible to offend Roman ears; then before the judgment on appeal had been given, he slipped away and returned quietly home, always on foot and in unassuming dress.

Pope Leo showed himself much incensed. The enquiry, which was pursued apart from Hilary, established that the chief of the disqualifications alleged against Chelidonius, marriage with a widow, was not real. His Bishopric of Besançon was restored to him. As for the Bishop of Arles the Pope treated him with extreme severity. In the letter[2] which he addressed on this subject to the Bishops of Viennensis, he reproached him for his hastiness, his domineering methods, his recourse to secular force, his encroachments upon provinces which did not depend upon him. "What are these usurpations? Before Patroclus none of his predecessors exercised his authority within limits of this kind. Patroclus himself only used it thus by a concession of the Holy See, a concession of a temporary character, revoked subsequently and with reason (*sententia meliore*)." Thus the Bishop of Arles could no longer pretend to any jurisdiction outside the Viennensis properly so-called. Moreover, Hilary was declared deprived of his rights as metropolitan over this province: they passed to the Bishop of Vienne[3];

[1] He is represented as being husband of a widow, and in the magistracy which he had exercised before his promotion having pronounced capital sentences.

[2] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 407.

[3] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 450. We do not know what was laid down for the provinces of Narbonensis Secunda and of the Maritime Alps: it was no doubt upon the Bishops of Aix and Embrun that the consecrations were devolved.

it is solely as an act of grace that his bishopric has been left to him. In order that no one might be ignorant of it Leo obtained an imperial rescript[1] in which Hilary's condemnation was brought officially to the notice of the Patrician Aetius, and that in terms very hard for the Bishop of Arles. It was laid down therein besides that every bishop, of Gaul or elsewhere, who should be cited by the Pope to appear before him, must reply to the summons, and in case of refusal be compelled to do so by the governor of his province.[2]

After being thus smitten Hilary restricted himself to the care of his church. Despite the vehemence of the language which he had used at Rome, he thought it his duty to take every means to appease the wrath of Leo. One of his priests, Ravennius, and later two bishops, Nectarius of Avignon and Constantius of Uzès, presented themselves in his name before the Pope. A common friend, Auxiliaris, a former Prefect of the Gauls who was living in retirement at Rome, intervened in his favour.[3] But Leo remained inflexible: besides, the things which Hilary caused to be said to him were not, it would seem, of a character to give complete satisfaction. The disagreement persisted down to the death of the Bishop of Arles (May 5, 449).

With Ravennius, who succeeded him, things took a better turn. There was no occasion to maintain against him the measure which had deprived Hilary of his rights as metropolitan. However, the Bishop of Vienne, who had exercised them for some time, protested once more that it was to him and not to his colleague of Arles that tradition assigned them. In order

[1] Leonis Magni, *Ep.* 11; *Novellae Valentin.*, xvii., July 8, 445.

[2] Already, at the request of a Roman Council, held in 378, the Emperor Gratian had by an edict ordered the same thing. His rescript, however, had not been inserted in the Theodosian code. That of Valentinian III. appears in the collection of *Novellae*, drawn up under Majorian; but it did not enter into the *Breviarium* of Alaric. *Cf.* Vol II., p. 373; and *Revue Historique*, vol. lxxxvii. (1905), p. 15.

[3] St Hilary's biographer (c. 17) has preserved to us a very curious fragment of a letter addressed to the Bishop of Arles by this Prefect Auxiliaris. After high eulogies of Hilary and of his virtues he suggests to him the way to deal with the Romans. "The ears of the Romans are sensible to a certain softness of speech: if your Holiness could condescend to it, you would lose nothing by it and gain much." It is the *Parcere subjectis* of ancient Rome.

to content everybody Leo made up his mind[1] to divide the province between the two jurisdictions: Vienne found assigned to it the bishoprics of the north, Valence, Tarantaise, Geneva, and Grenoble. This time the Pope no longer insisted that each province should have its metropolitan: Aix and Embrun fell back under the jurisdiction of Arles.

The Holy See had every interest in settling this difference. At this moment it found itself engaged in a conflict which was serious in a very different way.[2] It was the morrow of the second Council of Ephesus in which Dioscorus had rehabilitated Eutyches. The Pope had in vain annulled the decrees of this assembly; the Emperor Theodosius II. was upholding them with all his energy: there was no obvious way out. Leo had placed on his side the sovereigns of the West; he was anxious that it should be clearly seen that he had behind him the whole Latin Episcopate, and did not neglect any step to gain its support. At his request the episcopate of the province of Milan met in council and sent him a collective adhesion to his letter to Flavian.[3] With the same object he turned to account the connexions of the Bishop of Arles. Ravennius was charged to collect signatures. It does not appear that he used all possible diligence, for the adhesions did not arrive till more than a year later: further they did not come from the whole of Gaul, but only from the region of the Rhône and from some places in Aquitaine. In Spain, too, the letters of Flavian to Leo and of Leo to Flavian, with documents in support, passed from bishopric to bishopric.[4] Later, when the legates had returned from Chalcedon,[5] Leo took care to inform Ravennius and his colleagues of the success which had been obtained there.

Hilary was still in this world when his friend St Germanus of Auxerre died at Ravenna (July 31, 448). He had betaken himself to the Court in order to avert from the Armorican cities a military reprisal with which Aetius was threatening them as a punishment for their continual insurrections. He was received at the palace, among the clergy, and among the

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 450, May 5, 450. [2] *Supra*, p. 292.

[3] *Leonis Ep.* xcvii., a document invaluable for the fact that from the signatures of the bishops it enables us to delimit the province of Milan, at the middle of the 5th century.

[4] Hydatius, *Chron.* c. 145. [5] Jaffé, *op. cit.* 479, 480.

people, as a living saint, just as in bygone days they had received St Martin. It was in a sort of triumphal procession that his remains were taken back to Auxerre; in Gaul, as in the island of Britain, his memory remained in high honour.

Three years after his death Northern Gaul underwent the invasion of Attila. A number of towns which were raising themselves painfully from previous calamities suffered at this time or were in fear of doing so. Metz was overthrown[1]: Paris and Troyes escaped. This occasion threw into relief the veneration inspired in the Parisians by the virtues of a consecrated virgin, Geneviève, whose name after so many centuries is still known and honoured in the capital. The conference between Attila and the saintly Bishop Lupus of Troyes is no less popular. The Huns were anxious to make themselves master of Orleans: they wished to cross the Loire there in order to carry war against the Goths of Aquitaine, their enemies. The town held out for some time, thanks to the energy of the Bishop Aignan (Annianus), who, like his colleague of Troyes, confronted, but in vain, the terrible King of the Huns. At last it was taken, when the army of succour arrived, under the command of Aetius and of the King of the Goths, Theodoric. Attila had to beat a retreat, and instead of crossing the Loire to resign himself to recrossing the Rhine. He returned to his own Pannonia.

In the following year (452) it was the turn of the Italians to tremble. The formidable visitor penetrated to them by way of Venetia. Aquileia, Concordia, Altinum, Vicentia, Verona, Brescia, Bergamo, Milan even and Pavia fell into his power. However, he did not pass the Po. Pestilence laid hold upon his horde. Aetius, reinforced from the East, held firm in Ravenna and even made some lucky strokes; lastly, the King of the Huns, who was highly superstitious, hesitated to march on Rome: Alaric, after having violated the hallowed metropolis, had not lived long. Rome defended herself by her prestige. They saw her, besides, appearing in the barbarian camp in the person of Pope Leo and of two distinguished senators, Avienus and Trygetius, who came in the name of the Emperor and of the Senate to bear proposals of peace.[2] Attila recrossed the

[1] "Plurimae civitates effractae . . . civitate quam effregerant, Mettis" (Hydatius, *Chron.* c. 150).

[2] Chronicles of Prosper and of Hydatius: *cf.* Jordanes, *Getica*, 42.

Julian Alps, and died in the following year at the moment when he was preparing a third expedition, that against Constantinople. The succession to him gave rise to such discords that the Huns speedily ceased to molest the poor Roman Empire.

The danger being removed, Roman life renewed itself for the last time in the cities of Northern Gaul. Favoured by the peace the bishops did not neglect the opportunities of meeting together. A small collection of canons,[1] drawn up at Angers by Bishop Thalassius, has preserved for us the canons of councils held at Angers itself in 453, at Tours in 461, at Vannes a little later. The distribution of the Empire in provinces was to cease with the Empire itself; but already the imprint of it was visible in the ecclesiastical organization in which the memory of it was to be preserved. The bishops of the Armorican Councils were, at any rate at Angers and at Vannes, comprovincials, bishops of Lugdunensis Tertia. In the minor legislation which they formulated the spirit of the province is strongly expressed. To them there joined himself of his own accord the Bishop of Bourges, metropolitan of a neighbouring province greatly menaced by the Goths. They stood closer and closer together in order to present a front to the common danger. One of the canons of the Council of Angers (c. 4) pronounces excommunication of the gravest kind against any who shall have concurred in delivering towns to the enemy.[2]

The days were becoming more and more evil. It was soon learnt in Gaul that Aetius, the Patrician dreaded by the barbarians, had been assassinated by the Emperor Valentinian III. (454); then, a few months later, that a similar attack had put an end to the life of this prince and to the

Prosper, writing in Rome, deals severely with the inertia of Ravenna and sets in relief the Roman embassy.

[1] In regard to this see my *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, ii., p. 244.

[2] *Si qui tradendis vel capiendis civitatibus fuerint interfuisse detecti, non solum a communione habeantur alieni, sed nec conviviorum quidem admittantur esse participes.* Besides the Goths, always to be dreaded, and the Saxon pirates established at the mouth of the Loire and in the neighbourhood of Bayeux, there were to be seen wandering in Armorica many Frankish or even British bands, sometimes in alliance with the Empire but always a source of little satisfaction.

Theodosian dynasty. Petronius Maximus, to whom these assassinations had yielded a momentary profit, himself disappeared in a disturbance, and Genseric's Vandals subjected Rome to pillage. At the news of this the Goths of Toulouse endeavoured themselves to make provision for the vacancy of the imperial throne: they thrust into it a Roman general, Avitus, an Arvernian by birth. But the latter lasted only a little while. From the following year (456) the Patrician Ricimer became master in Italy, and it was by his grace that the Emperors were proclaimed there. In this way there succeeded one another, Majorian, Severus, Anthemius. The first displayed himself in Gaul and even in Spain, where he organized an expedition against the Vandals. Ricimer, finding him too active, was not slow in suppressing him (461), and proclaimed Severus in his stead. But these proceedings were agreeable neither to Aegidius who was in command of the Roman forces in Gaul, nor to Marcellinus who with similar powers was governing Dalmatia. Aegidius had no particular Emperor; he was defending only the *Res Romana* and he did it with success, although Ricimer stirred up against him the Goths and the Burgundians. Whilst he lived, he caused Arles and the Armorican region to be treated with respect. On his death in 464 his son Syagrius,[1] established in the latter region, and, like his father, making use of the support of the Frankish chiefs, succeeded in maintaining in the north-west of Gaul a kind of Roman principality, almost detached from the Empire. It lasted down to the Battle of Soissons in 486.

In the rest of Gaul, Goths and Burgundians made continual progress at the expense of the Empire. After the death of Majorian, and especially after that of Aegidius, the resistance which they could encounter was in most cases insignificant. Already in 462 Narbonne had fallen through treason into the hands of the Goths. Absolutely the whole of Aquitaine, except for the cities of Bourges and of Auvergne, was speedily in their power. The Burgundians, established at Lyons and at Vienne, were marching rapidly southward. It was in this collapse of the Empire that there appeared the interesting literary studies of Sidonius Apollinaris. Sprung from a distinguished family of the Civitas Lugdunensis, and son-in-law of the

[1] It is this Syagrius to whom Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epp.* v. 5) makes so many compliments on his knowledge of the German language.

Emperor Avitus, Sidonius had at first lived in the official world and pursued to its highest stages the *cursus honorum*. To three Emperors, Avitus, Majorian, and Anthemius he had devoted panegyrics in verse, solemnly recited at Rome or at Lyons. Anthemius made him Prefect of Rome in 468. Shortly afterwards (*c.* 470) we meet with him again as Bishop of Auvergne. To the pomps, vain enough, of the dying Empire there succeeded for him grave duties. The King of the Visigoths, Euric,[1] who succeeded in 466 his brother Theodoric II., was vigorously pursuing conquest. The headquarters of the Civitas Arverna had become a frontier post. Sidonius proved there what was to be expected of him. The Bishop of Bourges happened to die. He exerted himself in spite of numerous difficulties to secure the election of a successor who was Roman in spirit. But Euric overcame the defences of this city: the Britons, who were summoned by Anthemius to his aid, were put to rout: the tide of Goths was continually rising: it reached the ramparts of the Arvernian city. Here Sidonius seconded the desperate efforts of his brother-in-law Ecdicius, who was in command in this country and delivered the last battles on behalf of Rome on the very spots where, with Vercingetorix at its head, Gaul had so brilliantly resisted the legions of Cæsar. But the hour had come. The last Emperor sent from Constantinople, Julius Nepos, entered into negotiations with the King of the Visigoths. To save Arles and Provence, Auvergne was sacrificed. Sidonius redoubled his exertions, protested, entreated, wrote to his colleagues of the Provençal Episcopate letters of the most moving kind. Nothing came of it. The saint of Pavia, Bishop Epiphanius, came to Toulouse on behalf of the government of Italy; he obtained peace, that peace to which was sacrificed the last remnant of Roman Aquitania. It only remained for the Bishop of Auvergne to experience the law of the Conqueror. His striking devotion to the cause of the Empire, a cause thenceforward lost, cost him removal from his episcopal city and internment in a place of security. A year later the Empire was at an end in Italy as it was in Gaul: the patriot bishop had nothing left to him save to allow himself to be reduced to acquiescence by the conquerors.

[1] G. Yver, "Euric, roi des Wisigoths," in the *Études d'histoire du moyen-âge dediées à G. Monod*, pp. 11 ff.

He was not the only one in this position. Already in one of his letters[1] he speaks of two bishops of the district of Arles, Crocus and Simplicius, both of them exiled. Even in the country occupied for the previous half century by the Visigoths, resistance to the barbarians continued in various forms: the clergy readily associated themselves with it, or at any rate were suspected of doing so. In these mournful days in which municipal organization was dissolving of itself when violence did not get the better of it, the Church alone offered something of cohesion. If the populace was moved by some great sentiment, it was the clergy, and above all the bishop, who was its organ. It was on him too that the blame was laid when it gave itself to hostile demonstrations. Heavier in hand than his predecessors, resolved to get rid once for all of the old fiction of the Goths as allied to the Empire, and to be its heir to the widest extent possible, Euric was not gentle to opposing forces. There is every appearance also that religious passion played its part in this matter, and that the King of the Visigoths was not always proof against the bad example which his Vandal colleague was setting him in Africa. In 475 a number of bishoprics[2] remained vacant in the three Aquitaines because the King opposed the replacement of the deceased holders; for lack of clergy many churches in the country districts and even in the towns had been abandoned; this material ruin proved advantageous to heresy.[3]

[1] "Taceo vestros Crocum Simpliciumque collegas, quos cathedris sibi traditis eliminatos similis exilii cruciat poena dissimilis. Namque unus ipsorum dolet se non videre quo redeat, alter se dolet videre quo non redit." Sidonius seems to mean that one of the episcopal cities had been destroyed and that the other is in sight of the place where its bishop had been interned. If it really refers to bishops of the province of Arles, we might think of those of Uzès, of Aps (Viviers), or of Avignon. A *Crocus* was Bishop of Nîmes, but, as it would seem, later; and then the Bishop of Nîmes could hardly have been considered by Sidonius as a comprovincial of the Bishop of Aix to whom his letter is addressed.

[2] Sidonius (*Ep.* vii. 6) mentions Bordeaux, Périgueux, Rodez, Limoges, *Gabalum* (diocese of Mende), Eauze, Bazas, Comminges, Auch.

[3] This is, I think, the meaning of a passage which is obscure, and no doubt has been altered: "Quam (ruinam spiritalem) fere constat sic per singulos dies morientum patrum proficere defectu ut non solum quoslibet haereticos praesentum verum etiam haeresiarchas priorum temporum potuerit inflectere."

Sidonius came over with considerable reluctance. But what was to be done? Even in Italy there were no longer Emperors. Barbarians for barbarians, the Visigoths were worth more than the people of Odoacer. The latter, moreover, made no claim to Gaul. The defeated bishop was kept for some time at Euric's Court, of which he has left us a picture full of interest.[1] Then he returned to his diocese and died there in peace a short time after (479). Euric was not unyielding. One of his ministers, Leo, was notoriously Catholic: the same was the case with the Count Victorius, Governor of Auvergne and of the neighbouring cities. Sidonius was highly pleased with these personages.[2] But the King had no intention of tolerating any opposition which had a political character. As master of Provence he caused the arrest of Faustus, the Bishop of Riez, and sent him into exile. Not only in his reign but also under the government of his son Alaric II., measures of this kind were taken in respect of certain members of the episcopate who were suspected, rightly or wrongly, of too close sympathies not for the defunct Empire but for the co-heirs of the King of the Visigoths, Gondebaud the Burgundian and Clovis the Salian.

Sidonius is a very noble representative of this Gallo-Roman loyalty which was destined to die for lack of anything to which to devote itself. He died a bishop, after having been Prætorian Prefect, Prefect of Rome and Patrician. Like all the old society he ended in the Church, bequeathing to it a fine tradition of moral dignity and intellectual culture. In his youth he had greatly loved the muses; on taking Orders he repressed his poetic fervour but continued to pay attention to his style, even to a somewhat excessive degree: one could wish that he were less *recherché* and more clear.

He was not the only writer in his world. The monasteries of Provence remained centres not only of religious life but also of literary activity. Many like Hilary of Arles, Lupus of Troyes, Eucherius of Lyons, entered upon it after having taken a distinguished position in secular affairs. The culture that they had received passed into the service of their new vocation; their homilies, if they were in a position to

[1] *Ep.* viii. 9.

[2] *Ep.* iv. 22; vii. 17; viii. 3; *Carm.* ix.; *cf.* Greg. Turon, *Hist. Franc.* ii. 20; *Gloria Martyrum*, 44.

deliver any, reaped the benefit of it, and so did their letters and other writings. They conducted a considerable propaganda there in favour of asceticism. This mode of life, after having given rise in previous generations to somewhat vigorous criticisms, had in the end established itself. Sidonius speaks always with great respect of the Gallo-Roman nobles who, like Sulpicius Severus and Paulinus, had retired from the world and lived a life of sanctity on their estates. Everyone held in high esteem the solitaries of the Provençal coast: the best proof of this is that everywhere they were sought after for the duties of the episcopate. Further, a warm welcome was given to books like the *Institutes* or the *Conferences* of Cassian, and the *Eulogy of Solitude* by Eucherius.

Not less interesting was another theme, furnished by the miseries of invasion. These disasters seemed to throw blame upon Divine Providence: it was necessary to justify it, to explain how it could have allowed the downfall of Rome and of her Empire. Already St Augustine and his pupil Orosius had set themselves to the task. A priest of Northern Gaul who had taken refuge at Marseilles, Salvian, published about 440 a new plea, his *De Gubernatione Dei*, in which like Orosius he lays stress on the virtues of the barbarians and sets them in opposition to the vices of the Roman populations. The latter have had only what they deserved. Thus God is justified.

Salvian exaggerates, we may not doubt the fact, both in the eulogy that he makes of the victors and in the invectives which he heaps upon the vanquished. His was, moreover, a temperament prone to extremes. We possess another work of his (*Ad Ecclesiam*) which is entirely devoted to proving that a good Christian is bound to bequeath his goods to the Church and to the poor and even only to keep out of them for himself, while alive, just what answers to what is strictly necessary. One would be more ready to reproach him for his rigour if he had not begun by submitting to it himself. He lived for a long time at Marseilles, regarded with the greatest respect.

The questions of Grace and Predestination, so vigorously discussed in the past, now made scarcely any stir. Prosper having disappeared from this controversy, it had sunk into peace when left alone. In Gaul everyone was in agreement. No one thought of upholding predestination: in this matter they

confined themselves to the teaching of the masters of Marseilles and of Lérins. Since the elevation of Honoratus to the See of Arles the monastery of the holy island had been governed by Maximus (426-33), then by Faustus; they also, one after the other, became Bishops of Riez. Faustus was a saintly man, highly famed for his virtue, his knowledge, and his eloquence. While still Abbat of Lérins he had procured a settlement at a council of the question of the relations between his monastery and the Bishop of Fréjus to whose diocese it belonged. The solution of which he secured the adoption[1] passed into a rule for similar positions. On becoming bishop he speedily attracted attention. Sidonius, when still a layman, held him in great esteem: he composed a whole poem in his honour and never ceased to surround him with affection and respect.[2]

Faustus was an orator: we still possess many of his sermons.[3] He was freely asked to speak at great solemnities: Sidonius heard him preach at the dedication of the Cathedral of Lyons. When people had difficulties in doctrine it was to him that they addressed themselves, as to an oracle in theology. The Council of Arles sent him as a deputy to Rome to pursue there the ecclesiastical affairs of the province: the Imperial Government employed him for its negotiations with King Euric. In short, he was, not from his see but from his personal authority, the most prominent of the prelates of Roman Gaul.

Like Pelagius, Faustus was a transplanted Briton. On becoming Bishop of Riez he settled near him his mother, a venerable dame whom Sidonius visited with great respect. He readily received his fellow-countrymen and did not omit, on occasion, to send them his writings.[4] The latter, it must be

[1] *Supra*, p. 25. [2] *Carm.* xvi.

[3] It is not easy to recover them in the MSS. collections where they are met with either under his name or that of Eusebius of Emesa or of others. In his edition in the Vienna *Corpus* Engelbrecht has tried to determine the compositions which might probably be attributed to Faustus. But his system raises many objections.

[4] A bishop (or abbat, *antistes*) Riochatus, on his return from staying with Faustus and on his way back to Britain, spent some time with Sidonius (*c.* 474) to whom he communicated some writings of the Bishop of Riez (Sidonius, *Ep.* ix. 9). About the same time or shortly before, Sidonius had been in relations with a British chief, Riothime or Riothame. The latter was at the head of a body of British auxiliaries whom the Emperor Anthemius had established in the city of Bourges to defend it against the Visigoths (Sidonius, *Ep.* i. 7; iii. 9; Jordanes, *Getica*, 45).

admitted, sometimes awakened objections, even controversies. One of them,[1] in which he maintained that God alone is incorporeal and that one could not say so much either of angels or of human souls when they are separated from their body, was attacked with a certain liveliness by Claudian, a learned priest of Vienne, brother of the Bishop Mamertus.

Another,[2] in which he declared insufficient conversions taking place at the last hour, was refuted later by St Avitus of Vienne. But it was especially in relation to grace that his doctrine was challenged, not at the moment but long after his death. There was among the clergy of Riez a priest named Lucidus, an uncompromising Augustinian, like Prosper in his early stage, who talked much about predestination and in the least restrained of terms. Faustus endeavoured to lead him to other views: he discussed things with him alike by word of mouth and by writing: then seeing that he made no progress delated the rebel to the metropolitan of Arles, Leontius. The matter was examined in a great council held at Arles in 473 or 474. To it came some thirty bishops, not only from the Provençal region that was still Roman but from the provinces of Vienne and of Lyons which were already subject to the Burgundian kings. Before this august assembly Lucidus submitted himself and attached his signature to the formulas that were presented to him.[3] Bishop Faustus, commissioned by the assembly to set forth at some length the doctrines approved by the Council, devoted to them his two books on *The Grace of God and Free Will*.[4] In this famous work Faustus does not show himself tender towards Pelagius. He makes no difficulty about condemning the "blasphemies," the "abominations," of this

[1] *Ep.* 3 (Engelbrecht). Sidonius was linked with Claudian as with Faustus; this conflict caused him a little embarrassment (*Ep.* iv. 2, 3; *cf.* v. 2). The three books of Claudianus Mamertus, *De statu animae*, still exist.

[2] *Epp.* 4, 5. Avitus' *Epistle* to Gondebaud, ed. Peiper, p. 29. Avitus thinks that the Faustus who is author of the letter that he is combating is Faustus the Manichean against whom St Augustine wrote. As for the Bishop of Riez, for whom he professes the highest respect, he is, in his eyes, out of the reckoning.

[3] *Monumenta Germaniae: Scriptores antiqui*, viii., pp. 288, 290: Faustus, *Epp.* 1, 2 (Engelbrecht).

[4] Ed. Engelbrecht, p. 3; *cf.* Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, lviii., pp. 783, 835. We see from the dedication to Leontius of Arles that the bishops of the province of Lyons had demanded some amplifications.

"pestiferous doctor." Pelagius had been solemnly censured by all the authorities of Church and State; Faustus could not spare him his anathemas. Yet it is scarcely on anything except original sin that he separates himself from him. On the relations of grace and free will, on the nature of grace, he is not far from thinking like his compatriot: free will has suffered, it is true, from the original Fall; however, it subsists and counts for something in the merit of our actions. Grace is above all exterior: it consists much less in an internal and personal assistance than in the concession of free-will itself, of the Law, of good examples, of exhortations, and so on. Cassian himself did not go so far. As for predestination as Augustine had taught it, and above all as unskilful disciples were presenting it here and there, it was for Faustus a damnable heresy. As a matter of fact he never utters the name of Augustine; but except for the few lines which he devotes to the despatch of Pelagius, it is he that he is fighting from one end of his exposition to the other.

We may believe that the bishops assembled at Arles did not confine themselves to dealing with these subtle questions. Whether they came from the land where the Burgundians, despite the devotion which they proclaimed for the Empire at bay, were the masters in fact, or from the Roman cities for which the lower Rhône and the Cevennes proved a poor defence against the Visigoths, the minds of all of them were full of Euric, of his plans, of the pitiful condition of the Empire. Pope Hilary had favoured the centring of the Gallican Episcopate round the metropolis of Arles. Thus united, the bishops seemed to him better in a position to defend the political interests of Rome and above all the religious interests of which they had directly the charge. Hence, in his correspondence with Leontius and his colleagues,[1] he was seen returning in some respects to the views of Pope Zosimus. Without expressly reconstituting the Vicariate which had disappeared, he readily instigated the Bishop of Arles to put himself forward and to act. But Leontius was not Patroclus: he did not feel himself made for principal parts. Hilary died: his successor Simplicius does not seem to have pressed the matter. Besides circumstances were stronger than wishes. The last hour was striking for Roman Gaul. In 477 Euric made himself master of Arles, of

[1] On this see my *Fastes épiscopaux*, i. pp. 128 ff.

Marseilles, and of the whole of Provence as far as the Alps. We do not know the details of the annexation. There was perhaps some measure of resistance. Faustus compromised himself in it without doubt, for he was exiled to a place very far from his home. Sidonius, who had also been exiled, had ended by allowing himself to be conquered. They did not so easily get the better of the Briton who was Bishop of Riez. So long as Euric lived he remained in exile. It was only after the death of that prince in 485 that he returned to his episcopal city, where he must have died soon after, for he was far advanced in years.

3. *St Patrick, Apostle of Ireland.*

Suddenly to the north of the Roman world, insular Britain, carved out since the time of Diocletian into four provinces,[1] had to struggle against Celtic barbarism before it found itself invaded by the Germans of the continent. The Scoti of the neighbouring island, which had always remained independent, attacked it by sea; by land, from the side of Caledonia, the Picts, who themselves also had remained outside Roman attacks, crossed the walls of Hadrian and of Antoninus and gave much trouble to the imperial garrisons. When the latter, in the time of Honorius and of Constantine III., were forced back upon the continent, the Britons who were stationary and more or less Romanized did not succeed in organizing defence. They did not cease to summon to their aid people who had only too much to do in Gaul and in Italy. It was at that time that emigration began and that groups of Britons, crossing the sea in succession, went to establish themselves on the continent, in the Armorican peninsula.[2] Then came the Danish pirates, Jutes, Angles, Saxons, who after some expeditions for plunder secured a definite position there and installed themselves in the east of the country.

The Roman institutions did not hold out against this double torrent. Provinces and cities disappeared, and not only as

[1] *Britannia Prima and Secunda*, *Flavia Caesariensis*, *Maxima Caesariensis*. In 369 there was added a fifth province *Valentia* (Ammianus Marcellinus, xxviii. 3, 7). We do not know exactly how the country was portioned out among these jurisdictions.

[2] Others pushed as far as Spain, where the Bishopric of Britonia (Mondonedo), on the north coast of Galicia, long preserved the memory of their colony.

social and political groupings: the buildings were delivered to the flames and destroyed. The Latin language, which does not seem to have been implanted so deeply as in Gaul, was abolished in common use, and only preserved among the clergy. People began again to speak Celtic. The local Church itself, the episcopal organization, was engulfed in the enormous *débâcle*. When a little order had been re-established, there were no longer to be found either cities or boundaries of cities, or bishoprics, or episcopal dioceses. There had been a return to five centuries earlier, to the *régime* of the tribe. The religious grouping had as centres certain monasteries in which the remnant of the clergy was merged little by little in the predominant mass of monks.

On the British Church in the days of the Romans we have hardly any certain pieces of information.[1] In some places there was preserved the memory of local martyrs, St Alban at Verulamium, Saints Aaron and Julius at Caer-Leon.[2] The first missionaries had doubtless come from Gaul.[3] It was in Gaul that the Britons had their ecclesiastical relations. We see British bishops at the Council of Arles in 314.[4] In the conflicts of the 4th century this episcopal body followed the movements of that of the Gauls. With it they acclaimed Athanasius when rehabilitated by the Council of Sardica, then abandoned him when Constantius had become master in the West; with it they offered opposition in 357 to the Formula of Sirmium and

[1] Gildas, who wrote about the middle of the 6th century his *De Excidio Britanniae* (ed. Mommsen, *Monumenta Germaniae*, *Script. Ant.* xiii., pp. 25 ff.), does not know of any local document on the history of his country, either because there had never been any or because they had disappeared in the catastrophes of the invasion (c. 4).

[2] Gildas, *De Exc. Brit.* 10.

[3] The Legend of King Lucius would connect these origins with Pope Eleutherus. This legend is only known to us by the *Liber Pontificalis* (see my edition, vol. i., p. cii.); it is Roman in origin and not indigenous. Harnack (*Der Brief des britischen Königs Lucius an den Papst Eleutherus* in the Transactions of the Berlin Academy, 1904, p. 909) has conjectured that it might connect itself with Edessa and be related to the conversion of that country. His arguments have not convinced me.

[4] Eborius of York, Restitutus of London, Adelfius of Lincoln. In the list of signatures we find after these names, *Exinde Sacerdos Presbyter*, *Arminius diaconus*. These represented perhaps a fourth Church. At this Council there was, generally speaking, a bishop for each province. We should have here the representation of the four British provinces.

went astray in 359 at the Council of Ariminum: three[1] at least of their members took an active part in this assembly. The Bishop of Rouen, Victricius, in the time of St Martin, visited the British churches.[2] Later it was the turn of St Germanus of Auxerre.

As has been seen above,[3] the views of Pelagius found an echo among his former compatriots. Two of their bishops, Severian and Fastidius, are known as having upheld them. In the contrary sense worked a deacon, Palladius, who succeeded in setting in motion Pope Celestine and the episcopate of the Gauls. St Germanus of Auxerre twice visited the main island; his biographer lays stress on the success of his missions, and the chronicler Prosper is not less definite. Pelagianism, none the less, left some traces in Britain[4] and above all in Ireland, to which Christianity was penetrating just at this time.

The island of Erin (*Ivernia*, *Hibernia*), where the Romans had never set foot, had remained also outside Christianity. In 431 it was learnt at Rome that the Scoti were coming over to the faith of Christ. This same deacon Palladius, who displayed so much zeal against Pelagian propaganda, was ordained by the Pope in order to be their "first bishop."[5] Prosper, from whom we learn this fact, does not fail to extol Pope Celestine for the merit of having, after preserving to Catholicism the Roman island (Britain), made Christian the barbarian island (Ireland). In this there must be some exaggeration, for Irish tradition has preserved no memory of Palladius and his apostolate. The fact of his ordination by the Pope remains indisputable; but it is doubtful if the evangelization of Ireland owes much to this man of goodwill. It is to St Patrick[6] that local tradition gives

[1] The latter were very poor: they had to allow themselves to be supported by the Government. Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* ii. 41.

[2] *Supra*, p. 117. [3] *Supra*, p. 189.

[4] Gildas says not a word either of the Pelagian business or of the troubles of the 4th century. As to what is earlier than his own time he retains only the memories of martyrs indicated above.

[5] Prosper, *Chron.* cccciv.; *Contra Coll.* 21.

[6] We shall only take account here, so far as concerns the evangelization of Ireland, of the two letters of Patrick and the writings of Prosper. The biographies of Patrick form a long series, of which the most ancient bounds are: (1) the Narratives of Bishop Tirechan which reproduce the communications oral or written of another bishop, Ultan, who died in 656; (2) the Life of Patrick by Muirchu Maccu-Machteni, dedicated to a bishop who died in 698. These documents, together with all the texts relating to

the honour of it, and this reminiscence is supported by contemporary documents of an authoritative and significant kind, emanating from Patrick himself—his "Confession" and his letter to Coroticus. The story derivable from these documents is as follows.

The future apostle of Ireland belonged to a family established in Central Britain in a place called *Bannaventa Berniae*.[1] His great-grandfather Odissus had been a priest; his father Calpurnius, son of Potitus, was a deacon and at the same time member of the municipal council.[2] At 16, Patrick was carried off in company with many others by a band of Scoti, and taken to Ireland where for six years he lived in the station of a herder of pigs. Despite his clerical origin he had been up to that time somewhat undevout. Piety came to him in misery. Warned in a dream to return to his own land, he succeeded in reaching the shore and embarked with a troop of pagans who were crossing to the main island. After various adventures he found his family again, and lived with them for a considerable time. He had visions: he heard voices; sometimes it seemed to him that in him an invisible being was praying and speaking. All these mysterious appeals combined to take him back among the Scoti of Ireland in order to draw them from paganism and to initiate them in the true Faith. He entered the ranks of the clergy and was promoted to the

St Patrick, appear in volume ii. of the *Tripartite Life of St Patrick*, a publication of Mr Whitley Stokes, London, 1887 (*Rerum Britannicarum Scriptores*). In this edition the *Corpus Patricianum* is reproduced in the form in which it is contained in the Book of Armagh, a MS. executed in 807. The two compositions that I have cited specially had already at this date undergone some retouches or additions. To the credit of Tirechan I should be unable to attribute anything beyond p. 331, line 9 (cf. *Bulletin Critique*, 1888, p. 281). In what can be attributed to him there is scarcely anything but local traditions, already highly embellished by two centuries of oral preservation: the Irish memory, quite as active as the Oriental memory, has here worked with particular vigour: it was concerned with the apostle of the nation and also with the interests of the Church of Armagh which claimed in a special manner succession from him.

[1] Daventry, to the west of Northampton. The place is indicated three times in the Itinerary of Antoninus, under the name of Bannaventa (there are some variations), pp. 470, 477, 479. As for Berniae, this determinative is only attested by the *Confession*. Daventry is situated on an ancient Roman way near the place where the roads cross which coming from north and west proceed towards London.

[2] *Ingenuus fui secundum carnem: decorione patre nascor* (*Ad Coroticum*).

diaconate. His project of returning to Ireland and preaching the Gospel there cost him much opposition and mortification. He triumphed over them and succeeded in procuring consecration as a bishop; after this he once more crossed the Irish Sea and began his preachings. As might be expected his apostolate was a protracted work, painful and shot through with troubles of every kind. But success came; it was of a striking kind. In the closing days of his life Patrick could rejoice himself with the sight of the Irish become a Christian people, whilst before him they knew no other gods but their idols.[1] He had baptized there thousands of persons, ordained clergy in great numbers. The ascetic life was flourishing around him: there were to be seen monks and even virgins who were Scots. It is not without difficulty that such vocations were maintained. Patrick's religious women had much to suffer from their relations if they were noble, from their masters if they were of servile condition.

The apostle took care to receive nothing from his neophytes, whether on the occasion of baptism or for ordination. The faithful and the virgins threw upon the altar offerings of various kinds, articles of ornament. Patrick compelled them to take all this back. Faithful to God's order he meant to remain in Ireland until he died. It is not that he would not have been happy to see his native country and his kinsfolk once more: he might even have gone as far as Gaul to visit his "brethren," and to behold the face of the Saints of the Lord. But he clung to his vocation: "Such is," he says, "my confession before I die."

His letter to Coroticus, sub-regulus of the British coast,[2] is a document of an episodical kind. Coroticus with a band of pirates had made an incursion into a place where Patrick

[1] "Unde autem Hiberione qui numquam notitiam Dei habuerunt, nisi idola et immunda usque semper coluerunt, quomodo nuper facta est plebs Domini et filii Dei nuncupantur?" (ed. Whitley Stokes, p. 369).

[2] Zimmer (Hauck's *Encyclopädie*, x., p. 221), for reasons of considerable weight, identifies the "Kingdom" of Coroticus with the land of Strathclyde, situated between the two walls of Antoninus and Hadrian, on the side of the Irish Sea. It is in this same land that—at a later date, I believe—a British bishop Ninian, brought up at Rome, founded a centre for apostolic work among the Southern Picts and built a church under the dedication of St Martin. Such at any rate is the tradition collected by Bede (*H. E.* iii. 4). The place referred to here is Withorn, in the peninsula of Galloway.

was celebrating the Easter festival, surrounded by a large number of neophytes. Several of his flock had been massacred: the women, taken away as prisoners, were sold to the pagan Picts and Scots established in the main island. Patrick launched against the ravishers the most energetic maledictions. He is especially indignant that they should treat in this way the children of Ireland, now that community of faith puts them on the same footing as the Britons and they are "Romans" exactly like themselves.

Those venerable writings in which there unbosoms itself a soul generous, restless for the Divine, tormented for the welfare of others, conscious of an immense spiritual fatherhood, are in a language absolutely extraordinary. A clerk and sprung from a clerical family, Patrick would early have had a tincture of Latin. Seriously impaired, no doubt, by his early sojourn in the pig-sties of Ireland, it must have been somewhat restored during the years that he lived once more in Britain; then it was dissipated anew in the long years of pastoral ministration among peoples who knew only their Celtic speech. Hardly any of it remained[1] at the time when the Apostle of Ireland had recourse to the language of Rome in order to communicate with his fellow-countrymen in the main island.

It was, in fact, for them that he wrote his Confession. On the other side of the Irish Sea his work was being criticized. In the 7th century the Britons would not hear of anyone preaching the Gospel to the Anglo-Saxons, their invaders. Already in the 5th century they showed the same feelings in regard to the Scots. They were their enemies in this world: they were not anxious to meet them in Paradise, and scarcely liked the idea of anyone facilitating their access to it. It is against this absurd patriotism that Patrick is contending: it is to this that he opposes the Divine appeal, the inward voices, the mysterious vocation.

To the mission of St Patrick it is impossible to assign an exact date: the relations between the Scots and Britons are those of the 5th century; that is all that one can derive from the apostle's letters. Those who have desired greater precision have only obtained it by transporting into the history of

[1] He had a keen sense of it: "Sermo et loquela mea translata est in linguam alienam" (p. 359).

Patrick the chronology of Palladius in the form in which Prosper gives it. According to Prosper, Palladius was ordained in 431 by Pope Celestine in order to be the "first bishop" of the converted Scoti. If this refers to Scoti converted by Patrick, the episcopate of Palladius will be subsequent to the first evangelization of the land, and Palladius will not be the *primus episcopus*. If it refers to the first evangelization of the land, Patrick will have been wrong in declaring that before him Christianity had not been preached there. It is impossible to attribute such an error, let us say such a lie, to a man like St Patrick. He lived on the spot and knew at first hand what there was in the way of Missions to Ireland; and he would not, in a letter written to defend himself, have dared to boast himself of the merits of other people. Prosper, on his part, wrote very far from Ireland; it is very possible that he had never heard any mention of Patrick, or, knowing of him very vaguely, had not appreciated with exactness the importance of his rôle. The British bishops among whom Palladius lived would hardly have been disposed to exalt a man whom they had so greatly opposed.

In my opinion, Palladius came after Patrick, perhaps after his death, perhaps in his life-time, as the organ of that British opposition against which the apostle was obliged to defend himself.[1] And when I say that he came, I mean that he was ordained in Rome to be bishop in Ireland, not in any way to assert that he exercised his ministry there, nor even that he landed in the island.

Patrick had laid the foundations. Others came after him, workers unknown to us, who carried to Ireland and caused to be esteemed there, an intellectual culture of considerable breadth. In the 6th century the Irish monasteries were centres of study: masters, books, abounded there.[2] People came there to obtain

[1] Torrents of ink have been poured out upon this question since the middle of the 7th century, that is to say since the Irish made the acquaintance of Prosper and through him of Palladius. Matters were adjusted by making Palladius come before Patrick but only for a mission ephemeral in character and without results. Others identified Palladius and Patrick.

[2] We must not argue from this with the object of attenuating the importance of Patrick. It was certainly not he who introduced Literature into Ireland; but it is not necessary that literature should date back to the primitive apostolate. To produce the literary expansion of the follow-

instruction even from the island of Britain, even from the continent.

The island of Britain was falling back into barbarism. Gildas who lived there in the first half of the 6th century had a very clear perception of it. Whilst there remained, he says,[1] the memory of what the Saxon catastrophe had ruined, while it was possible to hope for Roman help, kings, magistrates, men in private station, priests and clergy held on the old lines. This generation disappeared, a time of respite came in the invasion, tranquillity returned and each let himself go. Then took rise the terrible disorders against which he protests at length, buttressing himself with innumerable quotations from the Bible: "Britain has kings, but they are tyrants . . . Britain has priests, but they are madmen. . . ." This philippic produces the most unfavourable impression: with Roman order had disappeared ecclesiastical discipline. Britain was passing back into a sort of savage state, of which Christianity felt the effect only too severely.

Despite his pessimism the terrible censor admits some exceptions: as a matter of fact, the legends of the saints imply that here and there, in the monasteries, great examples were set by men of God, and that their voice was lifted with not less zeal than that of Gildas to protest against the decadence and to produce, in a new organization, a real restoration of religion.

4. *The Vandal Persecution.*

Since it had crossed the Rhine in 407, the Vandal horde had had many adventures in Gaul and especially in Spain. From its conflicts with the Suevi, the Goths, and the Romans it had emerged greatly diminished in numbers. With what remained of it and the remnants of the Alans, who themselves had been severely handled by the Goths, King Gonderic re-formed in Andalusia a force which was formidable enough.

ing centuries it was enough that some practised grammarians should have transported themselves to Ireland, just as some Italian teachers proved sufficient to determine in England the literary movement of the 8th century and some English teachers to produce in France the Carolingian renaissance.

[1] Chapter 26.

It was beginning to make itself talked about in Spain when events drew it to Africa. Gonderic had just died: it was his brother Genseric for whom it was reserved to be the leader of the exodus.[1]

To the Count of Africa, Boniface, of whom the intrigues of Aetius had made a rebel, the Court of Ravenna had opposed at first three generals, of whom he rid himself with ease, then a corps of Gothic auxiliaries commanded by Sigisvult.[2] Boniface, who knew the Vandals and found himself on quite good terms with them,[3] had no scruple in summoning them to his help. Genseric crossed the strait.[4] The African provinces, unscathed as yet, offered to the invaders a prey richer than Gaul and Spain, which had been incessantly pillaged for twenty years. From the time of their first operations we can see that the Vandals were going to work for their own benefit, without troubling themselves too much about supporting Boniface. Whilst they were advancing slowly across the Mauritanias, burning, massacring, and pillaging, the rebel Count effected a reconciliation with Placidia. But the barbarians found themselves well off in Africa: Boniface did not succeed either in persuading them to return to Spain or to set a bound to their devastations. He was obliged to fight, and he was beaten. The Vandals were besieging him in Hippo when St Augustine died there in 430. Clearly they were the stronger. It was with great difficulty that it was possible to come to agreement

[1] On the reign of Genseric see F. Martroye, *Genséric* (Paris, 1907). The sources to be consulted for the history of the Vandal persecution are, apart from certain official documents cited later, the chronicles of Prosper and Hydatius, ended the one in 455, the other in 468; the *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae* by Victor of Vita (*infra*, p. 443), of which we have two good editions—that of Halm in the *Monumenta Germaniae Auctores antiquissimi*, vol. iii.; and that of Petschenig in the Vienna *Corpus*. See also the fragments of the historians Priscus and Malchus in the fourth volume of Müller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (collection Didot), and Procopius *De Bello Vandalico*, i. 1-8.

[2] *Supra*, p. 194.

[3] His wife was an Arian and, it would seem, of the family of the Vandal kings. Augustine, *Ep.* 220; *cf.* Marcellinus, *Chron.* ad ann. 432.

[4] The date is a little uncertain. Prosper seems to indicate 427, but it is possible that this indication applies rather to the beginning of the hostilities against Boniface than to their consequence, the passage of the Vandals into Africa. The year 429, indicated by Hydatius, suits better the general progress of events.

with them in 435, by ceding to them an important part of the provinces that they had conquered. Four years later, breaking the treaty, they made themselves masters of Carthage (October 19, 439). Aetius, who was too much occupied in Gaul, could not intervene; an expedition sent from Constantinople achieved no result; once more it was necessary to treat (442). The Government of Ravenna relinquished to Genseric the rich provinces of the east, Proconsular Africa and Byzacena, together with a considerable part of Numidia: there was returned to it the rest of this province, together with the Mauritanias, devastated like a field after the passage of locusts. Moreover, this arrangement was only effective down to the death of Valentinian III. in 455. From that time onwards the whole of Africa was finally lost.

And not only was it lost, not only did its taxes flow no longer into the coffers of the State, and its corn into the granaries of the Roman Food-Administration; but it became, under its new masters, a continual menace to the poor Empire, already so sick. The barbarians learnt to manage ships. Of the great port of Carthage they had speedily made a nest of pirates. Each year, especially after the death of Valentinian III., their fleets issued from it and spread terror in the Mediterranean. The Balearic Islands, Corsica, Sardinia, fell into their hands. They possessed fortified posts in Sicily, notably at Lilybæum. In 455 they sacked Rome, an exploit easy and profitable, which brought to Genseric not only a rich booty but also valuable hostages, the Empress Eudoxia, widow of Valentinian, and her two daughters Eudocia and Placidia, not to speak of many other captives. From that time onwards they did not cease to ravage the coasts of Spain, Italy, the Peloponnese, Epirus and Dalmatia.

In vain did the Eastern Empire, in default of the exhausted West, seek to bridle their audacity. All the expeditions attempted against Carthage failed miserably. The last in 468, that which, in the reign of Leo and Anthemius, Basiliscus the future Emperor led up to the walls of Carthage, sustained, thanks to its leader's inexperience, a disaster so grave that a new effort was no longer ventured. The African provinces had become a Vandal kingdom; of five centuries of Roman domination and of Latin culture there now remained only faint traces.

The Roman officials were, of course, driven back upon Italy.

Everywhere the band of marauders had hunted the rich: the *curiales*, the holders of property, were marked out first for their greed. When they were not massacred, they were tortured by cunning means to extract money from them, or else they were made slaves. The same treatment was applied to the clergy, especially to their leaders. The Vandals were Arians of a more fanatical type than the other barbarians. Thus it was for them a double entertainment to burn the churches after having plundered them and to subject to all sorts of insults the unhappy clergy who fell into their hands. They had with them a complete ecclesiastical hierarchy: the Arian priests and bishops in no way set themselves to moderate their excesses. Quite the contrary: they believed and said that the moment had come to avenge themselves for the contumely and ill-treatment with which their co-religionists had been overwhelmed in the Roman Empire. It was from them that there came the worst counsels. Even before the taking of Carthage a number of Catholic bishops had been driven not only from their churches but from their cities themselves. It was in this way that Possidius of Calama, the friend and biographer of St Augustine, and two of his colleagues, Novatus and Severian, were exiled in 437.[1]

At Carthage, Genseric, when he entered it, drove the Catholics from the greater part of the churches: his head bishop or patriarch installed himself in the Basilica Restituta, the metropolitical church: the other churches of the town, with the sanctuaries of St Cyprian and St Perpetua, were equally assigned to the Arian worship. As for the clergy, they rid themselves of them by the most expeditious method. To Bishop Capreolus, who occupied the see at the time of the Council of Ephesus, there had succeeded Quodvultdeus, another friend of St Augustine. He was arrested with the greater part of his clergy; then, after having been stripped of all that they possessed, they were thrown into wretched vessels which carried them to Naples. Similar treatment was applied to the senators and other members of the aristocracy of Carthage.[2]

[1] *Chronicle* of Prosper.

[2] Of these some took refuge in Rome or at Constantinople. We find them even as far as Syria. Theodoret welcomed to his abode a member of the *Curia* of Carthage named Celestiacus, and recommended him to various persons such as the Bishops of Antioch, Tyre, Emesa (*Epp.* 29-36; cf. *Ep.* 70).

The public ceremonies of Catholic worship were forbidden even for the burial of the faithful; they gave chase to those clergy who had been able to escape the great raid; these were despatched to the interior.

After these measures characterizing the first establishment came the systematic occupation of the country. Genseric established his band in Proconsular Africa or Zeugitana: the cities, which were very numerous, of the Valley of the Bagradas were shared between the barbarian visitors. They established themselves there on church property and on that of the rich, who were ejected or reduced to servitude.[1]

For the common people, of whom they could not rid themselves, they preserved the former administration, the *curiae*, the governors (*iudices*), the finance officials. Their grudge was only against the upper classes, those who represented the old Roman *régime* and who were suspected of desiring its restoration. One day Genseric saw the arrival, on the shore of Maxula where he was taking the air, of a deputation of bishops and notables who had come to beseech him that at least after having taken all that they had he would allow them to live in peace in the midst of their fellow-countrymen. The king burst into a rage: he wanted to have them thrown into the sea, and there was some difficulty in hindering him. The unfortunate men went back greatly discomfited. From that time Divine Service was no longer celebrated in Proconsular Africa except in secret and miserable lurking places.

For his personal share the king had allotted himself the southern provinces, especially Byzacena, where stretched vast demesnes imperial and private. There, since the Vandal population was not represented save by a few administrators, the Catholics had a little more liberty. Not having any use for their churches, the Vandals had left them to them; but the bishops were obliged to keep a watch over their discourses, to avoid in particular handling roughly Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar, Holophernes and other Biblical tyrants: vigilant police officers had ears open for allusions. Several bishops, among them the Primate of Byzacena, Crescens, were exiled for observations of this kind: others on grounds just as futile.

[1] Ἐν ἀνδραπόδων μοίρᾳ, says Procopius (*Bell. Vand.* i. 5): he represents this condition as that which befell the proprietors of the domains assigned by Genseric to his two sons Huneric and Genzon.

The African Episcopate was thus scattered on all sides, in the East[1] as in the West.

For a dozen years (442-455) Western Numidia and the Mauritanias, which had been given back to the Empire, enjoyed some respite. The Government of Ravenna legislated there.[2] On his part Pope Leo undertook from the point of view of religion the direction of the episcopate. We find him holding an enquiry into the state of discipline in Mauritania Cæsariensis and taking measures for the observance of the ancient ordinances. He seems in this to have substituted himself for the Council of Africa and the Bishop of Carthage, organs for the moment arrested. However, in a letter[3] which gives evidence of his intervention he does not in any way refer to their default: it is in virtue of the authority of the Apostolic See that he speaks and acts.

In 454, on the representations of Valentinian III., Genseric allowed the Catholics to elect a bishop at Carthage. Quodvultdeus had died in Campania: the choice of the faithful fell upon a clerk named Deogratias: one of the churches of the town was given back to him, the Basilica of Faustus, and here the ordination took place.[4] The charity of this holy man made some of the Arians themselves love him. It was displayed especially in the following year when the vessels of Genseric on their return from the sack of Rome cast upon the pavement at Carthage an enormous number of captives. Deogratias died too soon, in 457. On his death, Genseric, who had no longer any measures of accommodation to observe with the phantoms of Emperors that Ricimer was making and unmaking, forbade not only the appointment of a successor to him but the replacement of deceased bishops throughout the whole breadth of the Proconsular province. At Carthage the Basilica of Faustus was closed once more and the clergy were sent into exile. From these severities he only relaxed shortly before his death, in 474, at the request of the Emperor Zeno and the representations of his ambassador Severus.

Arian propaganda was very active. It exerted itself

[1] Theodoret (*Epp.* 52, 53) recommends to the Bishops of Edessa and of Tella an African bishop named Cyprian who had been sent to him from Ancyra.

[2] *Novella* 13 (18) of Valentinian III., June 21, 445.

[3] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 410.

[4] October 25, 454 (*Mon. Germ. Auct. ant.* ix., p. 490).

especially in the *entourage* of the king, where it had been absolutely necessary to admit Romans. It was not with the Vandal *personnel* that the new State could have been made to work: the experience and culture of the vanquished were laid under contribution. At the beginning Catholics abounded in the palace of Genseric. From time to time he had a dream of converting them, in order to compromise them further with the *ancien régime* and its supporters. Under the year 437 Prosper registers an attempt of this kind upon four Spaniards of the Vandal Court—Arcadius, Paschasius, Probus, Eutychianus. Proscribed, exiled, tortured, in the end they suffered death rather than deny their faith. To one of them, Arcadius, the Bishop of Constantina, Antoninus Honoratus, addressed in the midst of his sufferings an exhortation to martyrdom [1] which recalls the time of Origen and of Tertullian. Sebastian, the son-in-law of Count Boniface, who was urged also to become an Arian, succeeded at first in evading the proposal; but Genseric soon found means of getting rid of him. Other facts of this kind are known to us in detail.[2] The Arian bishops ended by securing from the king that neither in his household nor that of his sons should there be any Catholic *employé*.[3]

We cannot say that Genseric had conceived a design of abolishing Catholicism in Africa: it would have been too difficult, and besides what good would it have been? What mattered to the King of the Vandals was that his Roman subjects should not, under colour of religion, cause him difficulties either internal or external. For that it sufficed to weaken their ecclesiastical organization, to keep it in a state of humiliating inferiority in relation to the Arian hierarchy, and to take away from the Catholic faith all the support, all the respect, which could come to it from the temporal position of its adherents. The Roman population, deprived so far as possible of its leading elements, the clergy and the aristocracy, was bound to form, under the rule of the conquerors, a people of rayahs. In its ranks it included a number of persons who had no serious reasons for regretting the past. It might be hoped that they would set the tone and that in the end there

[1] Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, I. p. 567.
[2] Victor i. 43-50.
[3] Victor i. 43; *Cf.* Hydatius *Chron.* ad ann. 440.

would be made of the Latins of Africa not, certainly, Vandals—that was not desirable—but good subjects of the Vandals.

Genseric pursued this end by brutalities, intermittent it is true, but always inspired by the same design and exercised always upon the same classes of persons, the clergy and the notables.

His son Huneric, who succeeded him in 477, continued at first this policy and even with less severity: he tolerated more largely meetings for worship. At bottom he was more fanatical than his father. The Manicheans were the first to find it out: he persecuted them with the greatest zeal. To his great scandal he found many of them among his own people, among others an Arian monk named Clementianus who had had tattooed on his thigh the inscription, *Manichaeus discipulus Christi Jesu*. Several of them were burnt alive, others sent overseas. In 481, at the request of his sister-in-law Placidia and of the Emperor Zeno, he authorized the Catholics to elect a Bishop of Carthage, on condition that the Arian churches should enjoy in the Eastern Empire the largest toleration.[1] The See of St Cyprian had been unoccupied for twenty-four years. The Bishops were accustomed to get on without a head: they raised difficulties. Persecution had not converted them to toleration: they resigned themselves to being ill-treated at home provided that abroad heretics were proscribed. But the people of Carthage were not of their opinion: they pressed their views and demanded a bishop. Eugenius was forthwith elected.[2] He was a saintly man whom his goodness and his almsgiving quickly made very popular, too popular even, for he speedily gave umbrage to the Arian clergy. The official bishops, among others a certain Cyrila who shortly afterwards became Patriarch, caused him to be forbidden to sit in his episcopal chair and to preach. He was then ordered not to receive in his church persons clad in Vandal fashion. Neither Vandals by race nor Romans who had gone over to their customs had permission to be Catholics. This prohibition was applied with an unheard-of barbarity. Police officials,

[1] On this negotiation see Victor ii. 1-5 and Malchus, *Frag.* 13 (Müller-Didot, p. 120).

[2] Victor of Vita was present at the assembly at which this matter was debated: he figured in the number of the opposing bishops (ii. 5).

posted at the entrance to the churches, seized with the aid of gigantic combs the flowing locks which distinguished the barbarian from the Roman: thus checked, the unfortunate people, men and women, were dragged by the hair, which was torn off them if necessary with the skin of the scalp, and submitted to the punishment of public exposure. Despite some cleansings practised by Genseric there were still Catholics in the palace; they were sent to reap the harvest in the plain of Utica under the burning heat of the African sun.

Huneric was a perfect tyrant. The Manicheans had already perceived it: he made it visible to the Vandals themselves. Genseric had ordained that the throne should always be occupied by the eldest of the male members of the royal family. This arrangement excluded the posterity of Huneric, for his brothers Theodoric and Genzon had children older than his: one of them, Theodoric, was still alive. All these collaterals were persecuted with ferocity: some of them perished, others were exiled. Anyone who was suspected of having supported them found himself the object of frightful treatment. The Arian Patriarch himself, Jucundus, was burnt alive in one of the squares of Carthage: he was one of the intimate friends of Theodoric.

All this tended to excite in the Catholics the most melancholy reflections. Already greatly bullied they looked for worse to come. They were not deceived. Under a pretext which we do not know, the King caused to be arrested and tried together nearly 5000[1] Catholics, of every rank, in whose number were bishops and other members of the clergy. He had them taken to the Moors of the southern frontier. *En route* they were subjected to abominable treatment.

This was but the prelude. On May 20, 483, Huneric addressed to all the "Homoousian" bishops a letter in which, on the pretext that despite so many prohibitions Catholic worship had not ceased to be celebrated on the lands of the Vandals (*in sortibus Vandalorum*), he ordered that scandal, that is to say religious dissent, should cease in his kingdom. To this end, in accord with his "holy bishops," he summoned the holders of the "Homoousios" to a conference with their colleagues who held the confession of Ariminum. The meeting

[1] Victor of Vita who accompanied them a part of the way gives the precise figure 4966 (ii. 26-37).

was appointed for February 1 in the following year: no bishop was to fail to be there.

It was Ascension Day. Archbishop Eugenius was celebrating this festival with his flock, to whom was added Reginus, an envoy of the Emperor Zeno. The royal edict was given to him: he was obliged to have it read. There was great consternation. There was no ground for deluding oneself: what the king desired was that there should no longer be Catholics. The conference was only a pretext and a trap.

Eugenius tried hard to parry the blow by claiming that, in this matter of universal interest, there should be summoned also representatives of the overseas churches, notably of the Roman Church *quae caput est omnium ecclesiarum.*[1] Huneric did not dream of listening to him. So far from allowing access to the conference to persons whom their character as strangers would have put in a position to speak firmly and freely, he hastened to exile those of the African bishops whose knowledge and eloquence might have proved an obstacle to his designs.[2]

On the day fixed, February 1, 484, the Catholic bishops of the whole Vandal kingdom, from the Balearic Isles to Tripoli, found themselves gathered together at Carthage. They were to the number of 466. To avoid any kind of disorder Eugenius introduced only ten of them into the place where the sessions were held. They found there no longer an arbitrator chosen from outside the two episcopal bodies in conflict, as at the conference of 411, but the Arian Patriarch Cyrila, surrounded by his colleagues and enthroned on an elevated seat. This gave them ground for protesting, and as in 411 much time was lost in minor wrangles. Cyrila, in great majesty, did not deign to understand Latin, although all Carthage knew that he spoke it to perfection. The people who had not been excluded became impatient: they were beaten. There were two sessions, the details of which we do not possess.[3] At the second the Catholics made up their minds to present a profession of faith, well supported with authorities, which they

[1] Victor of Vita, ii. 43.

[2] The Bishop of Vibia, Secundianus, and Praesidius of Sufetula were exiled, the first after being beaten: another, Laetus, who had been thrown into prison, was burnt alive on the eve of the conference (Victor ii. 45, 46, 92).

[3] No formal record has been preserved: we have only the account, a very brief one, of Victor of Vita, who was not present.

had prepared in advance. Cyrila and his party fell upon the first words, in which the petitioners described themselves as Catholics. Upon this there ensued a confused discussion; the Arians alleged that their opponents were provoking scenes of disorder. They succeeded so well that the King, without dismissing the bishops and without pronouncing the dissolution of the assembly, suspended the sittings, and caused to be published throughout the whole of Africa an edict, dated February 25, in which he declared that the "Homoousian" bishops not having ceased to violate the prohibitions made to them of practising their worship on the lands of the Vandals, he had summoned them all to Carthage for a conference with the prelates of his own religion; that, when required to prove the "Homoousios" or to accept the decisions adopted by more than 1000 bishops[1] at Ariminum and at Seleucia, they had refused, had sought to raise a disturbance, and had rendered discussion impossible. In consequence the King turned against the Homoousians all the penal laws which the Emperors, at their instigation, had enacted against the heretics. No more meetings for worship, no more religious ceremonies, either within the towns or outside them; confiscation of churches, of their properties, of the goods of the clergy, which are to be allotted to their Arian colleagues; seizure and destruction of religious books; expulsion and exile of the bishops and their clergy; prohibition to celebrate ordination; incapacity for any Catholic, to plead in court, to make a will or to inherit, to make or to receive donations. They were given to June 1 to comply.

It was the complete extirpation of Catholicism, something like what Decius and Galerius had dreamed of against Christianity in general. While waiting for the term fixed, attention was devoted to the bishops. The conference, plainly, had been only a lure: the bishops had been collected at Carthage in order that it might be easier to get rid of them. Previously despoiled of all that they possessed, without even a change of clothing, they were cast outside the town: anyone who should have given them hospitality would have been burnt alive. The unfortunate men endured in company

[1] The Bishop of Milan, Auxentius (see Vol. II., p. 285), reckoned for these two councils 600 bishops. A century after, the Arian tradition had raised this number to 1000.

hunger and the rigours of the season, not daring to separate for fear of some trap. Huneric happened one day to pass: they drew near in order to speak to him. The King took fright and ordered his horsemen to charge them. However, they were collected together in a public building, and there they were asked to swear that they would uphold Huneric's son if the King happened to die. The greater part accepted this condition; forty-six refused, alleging the Gospel which prohibits every kind of oath. They were exiled to Corsica where they were employed in cutting timber for the navy. As for the others, to the number of 302, they were deported to the interior of Africa and reduced to the condition of agricultural labourers. It was in this way that the Archbishop Eugenius was interned near the ancient Lake Triton, in a fort called *Turris Tamalleni*.[1]

It was all over with the episcopate.

As for the Catholic populace, all means were employed to convert them to Arianism. The sign of conversion was baptism, conferred afresh by Arian priests. We see reappear the prohibition to move about, to sell, to buy, to do any public act whatsoever, without exhibiting a certificate of conformity. The *libellatici* of this time, instead of sacrificing to idols, had allowed themselves to be rebaptized. There were a great number of them, although Victor of Vita does not speak of them willingly, and even in the higher ranks of the clergy; some deacons, some priests, some bishops consented to receive Arian baptism, thus recognizing that up to that time they had not been Christians.[2] There were also many forced baptisms, conferred upon people against their will, sometimes during their slumber and without their being aware of it. Bishop Habetdeum, interned with Eugenius at Turris Tamalleni, was one day dragged before the Arian bishop of the place, throttled, muzzled, and baptized by force. When, once let go, he saw that the Act of Baptism was being drawn up, the old priest declared "that in the Prætorium of his heart, the angels had drawn up a formal record of his protest and that he would present it one day to the celestial Emperor."

[1] Telmin, on the border of the Chott-el-Fedjadj.

[2] This follows from the Roman Council of 487. Victor says not a word of it.

We must read in Victor of Vita the harrowing details of the persecution, for they did not confine themselves to these sacrilegious counterfeits nor to the exile of bishops. Throughout the whole of Africa faithful Catholics were subjected to odious acts of violence; a great number perished, others were mutilated or became infirm for their whole lives. At Tipasa, in Mauritania Cæsariensis, the Bishop Reparatus who had figured at the conference was replaced[1] by a secretary of the Patriarch Cyrila. On his arrival the people of Tipasa embarked in great numbers on their vessels and took refuge in Spain. Those who remained were united in refusing to become Arians, and despite all prohibitions met together for assemblies of worship. On being informed by the new bishop Huneric had their tongues and right hands cut off. However, they did not lose the use of speech: several of them succeeded in escaping and took refuge at Constantinople where this miracle long remained famous.[2] Archbishop Eugenius added further by his austerities to the rigours of his miserable exile. The result was an attack of paralysis of which his guardian, a Vandal priest, took advantage to pour vinegar into his mouth. When the persecution ended, there were to be met everywhere, as had been formerly the case in the East, confessors whose bodies bore the mark of the tortures they had endured. Among this number were twelve choristers or readers of the Church of Carthage who twice suffered the bastinado rather than yield to the Arians. All the clergy of the capital, to the number of more than 500, had been condemned to exile. Before setting out they appeared one by one before an apostate, Elpidophorus, who was commissioned to give them the preliminary flogging. When it was the turn of the deacon Muritta, who had been the godfather of Elpidophorus, he was seen to take out of his bosom[3] the white

[1] The name of Reparatus is one of those to which in the Notice is added the siglum *prbt* (peribat): M. Gsell has with justice called attention to the fact (*Mélanges de l'École de Rome*, xiv., p. 318, note 1) that if he had apostatized as has been alleged, he would not have been replaced.

[2] Victor of Vita, iii. 29, 30; Æneas of Gaza in Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, lxxxv. p. 1000; Procopius, *Bell. Vandal.* i. 8; Justinian, *Cod.* i. 27, § 4; *Chronicles* of Marcellinus (484) and of Victor of Tunnunum (479); Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 14; St Gregory the Great, *Dial.* iii. 2.

[3] Victor v. 9.

robes of a neophyte. They were those in which he had clad Elpidophorus when coming out of the Catholic font: "See," he said, "minister of error, the clothes that will accuse thee before the sovereign Judge."

The summer of 484 was of exceptional dryness; famine was rife in the autumn; but in these calamities the barbarians saw no signs of the wrath of heaven. The debauch of ferocity continued in the way that the Arian clergy had desired it and Huneric had organized it. Horror of the Roman, hatred of the Catholic, let themselves loose without restraint. The King died on December 13 of the same horrible malady as had got the better of Antiochus, of Herod, and of Galerius.[1] His son Hilderic, whom he had so greatly desired as his successor, was put on one side: the Vandals preferred Genzon's sons to him, at first Guntamund (484-496), then Trasamund (496-523), so that he had to wait forty years before mounting in his turn his father's throne. Guntamund made no haste to moderate the persecution: it was only in the third year of his reign (487) that he recalled Archbishop Eugenius and allowed him to instal himself in the suburban church (*cœmeterium*) of St Agileus. Seven years later (494), on Eugenius' application, he recalled all the bishops from exile and caused the Catholic churches everywhere to be reopened.[2] This was not the end; for under Trasamund they had still some evil days to go through. It was to the son of the persecutor, to Hilderic, that it was reserved to restore peace to the Catholics of Africa.

Victor, Bishop of Vita in Byzacena, to whom we owe the history of the Vandal persecution, does not seem to have lived till the peace. In any case his book was written at the most serious part of the crisis, perhaps before the death of Huneric, after which he was able to introduce into it some retouches. It is a lament of a moving and thrilling character: the facts are set out in it as the victims saw them, with a minuteness which is less at the beginning, greater for the time of Huneric,

[1] *Putrefactus et ebulliens vermibus*, the conclusion added to Victor's Third Book; *scatens vermibus*, Table of the Vandal Kings, *Mon. Germ. Script. Ant.* xiii., p. 458.

[2] The Table of the Vandal Kings (*Mon. Germ.* loc. cit., p. 459) here gives exact dates which no doubt relate especially to Carthage: closing of the churches, February 7, 484: re-opening August 10, 494.

in which the author relates what he has seen and even transcribes the official documents.[1]

[1] Another document of the highest interest is the list (*Notitia*) of the body of bishops summoned to Carthage for the conference with the Arians in 484. It has come down to us in a rather bad state, in a single MS., at present preserved at Laon (Laudunensis 113, *Saec.* ix.). Some time after it was drawn up there were added to it marginal notes, in contracted form for the most part, to indicate what had become of the bishops, especially those of the Proconsular Province, and a final summary in which they are arranged in different categories. 88 *perierunt*, says this summary; 378 *permanserunt*. In the list the siglum *prbt*, which is deciphered as *peribat*, is added to 90 names. Some have seen in these 88 or 90 bishops so many apostates. That is not certain. It is in itself little likely that any one would have been anxious to preserve the trace of so many apostasies; besides, *perierunt* can very well be taken in its natural sense and translated by "are dead." By supposing that the notes were added only two years after the edict of Huneric, that is to say in 486, we arrive at a mortality of one-tenth per annum. This mortality has nothing extraordinary about it, especially given the severe labours, the bad treatment, the miseries of every kind which were inflicted on this body of men. *Cf.* the remarks of M. Gsell (*Mélanges de l'École de Rome*, xiv., p. 318, note 1; xxi., p. 209).

CHAPTER XV

THE ROMAN CHURCH IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

LIKE an old tree of which all the branches have been broken down by tempests and which can no longer raise anything save a sapless trunk, at the mercy of the last gust, Imperial Italy survived in piteous plight the disasters of the provinces. At Ravenna the daughter of the great Theodosius, Galla Placidia, had maintained for some time the dynastic tradition. That is all that can be said alike of her and of her son Valentinian III., a palace-Emperor whose pale majesty the armies never saw. Around them were woven military intrigues which resulted in the concentration in the hands of the Patrician Aetius of all the realities of power. He had a son Gaudentius, whom he proposed to marry to Eudocia, one of the daughters of the Emperor,[1] thus opening to his family the avenues to the imperial throne. But these avenues were guarded by another family, that of the Anicii of Rome, whose principal representative, Petronius Maximus, as loaded with honours[2] as Probus had been fifty years before, was dreaming of mounting higher still and of raising himself to the supreme dignity. Placidia had been dead (November 27, 450) some years when the Emperor, on the advice of his eunuchs, rid himself by assassination of the warrior who had rendered such great services to the Empire (September 21, 454). Six months had not elapsed since the death of Aetius when Valentinian III. himself fell under the steel of the assassins. The event took place in the course of a military display at

[1] The Eudocia who was later to marry Huneric, the heir of the Vandal kingdom.

[2] *Corpus Inscript. Lat.* vol. vi., nos. 1197, 1198, 1660, 1749. On his career see the memoir of L. Cantarelli in the *Bull. arch. comunale*, 1888, p. 47; *cf.* Ed. Cuq in the tenth volume of the *Œuvres de Borghesi*, p. 611.

the imperial villa, *Ad duas lauros* on the Via Labicana,[1] March 16, 455. Petronius Maximus was immediately acclaimed: the Anicii replaced the family of Theodosius. To hallow this succession the new Emperor appropriated the wife of the old: Eudoxia was compelled to pass without further delay into the arms of the man whom everyone was accusing of having made away with her husband. It was a species of legitimation. One legitimized one's position through the wife: the House of Theodosius, though poor in men, abounded in princesses. Marcian had espoused Pulcheria; the son of Aetius demanded one of the daughters of Valentinian III.; the other, named Placidia, like her grandmother, was promised to Olybrius, himself also a member of the Anician family. Petronius assigned to himself the mother, whose age happened to be less disproportionate to his own. According to the tale speedily told by malicious tongues,[2] Eudoxia, affronted, revenged herself by making an appeal to Genseric. It is highly improbable. The old corsair was quite capable of understanding for himself that, Aetius being no longer there, there was a fine *coup* to be made. The Vandal fleet appeared at the end of May in sight of the mouth of the Tiber. The Emperor Maximus in dismay thought only of flight and persuaded those who could do so to follow the example that he was about to set them. He did not set it: indignation provoked a rising: the populace tore the usurper in pieces and threw his severed members into the Tiber.

Pope Leo carried to the pirates the capitulation of the "mistress of the world." Genseric promised him that his forces should abstain from massacre and arson. Thus all passed off peacefully. The Vandals occupied themselves for fifteen days in removing to their vessels all that the "Eternal City" could offer for their convenience. With them departed

[1] *Chron. Min.* (*Mon. Germ. Auct. Ant.* ix., pp. 303, 483, 490). I do not know if there is any ground for relying on the romantic history which Procopius (*Bell. Vand.* i. 4) relates in this connexion. On this legend and on the complicity of Petronius Maximus in the two assassinations of Aetius and of Valentinian III., see the work of Morosi in fasc. 17 of the *Studi di storia e diritto*, Florence, 1882.

[2] Hydatius is already acquainted with this rumour: *ut mala fama dispergit* he says, which is the opposite to accepting it. See in regard to it Morosi, *loc. cit.* Prosper has not wind of it, any more than Sidonius Apollinaris and other contemporaries in a good position to be informed.

the family of Valentinian III.—Eudoxia, her two daughters Eudocia and Placidia, and even Aetius' son Gaudentius.

Rome, pillaged completely, remained without a government and the Empire with her. The Goths of Toulouse intervened. Avitus, a high official of Arvernian origin, happened to be on an embassy to their king, Theodoric. They proposed to him that they should support him. Acclaimed at Toulouse by the "allies" of the Empire, he was speedily acclaimed at Arles by his "subjects," then at Rome by the senate, finally at Constantinople where Marcian ratified his accession. His reign had an auspicious opening. In 456 the Vandals whose appetite had been whetted by the sack of Rome threatened Italy afresh: a fleet under the command of Ricimer, a general of Suevic origin, checked them as far north as Corsica and compelled them to return to Carthage. This success brought Ricimer to the front, unfortunately for the Arvernian Emperor towards whom he quickly assumed a threatening attitude. Avitus, who happened to be in Gaul, returned with the utmost speed to Italy; but Ricimer gave him battle at Placentia. Abandoned by his troops, the unfortunate man only saved his life by allowing himself to be ordained bishop[1]: moreover, he only survived a few months.

According to some pieces of information of a rather vague kind, the senate would seem to have played a part in this occurrence. There was still at Rome and in Italy a current of opinion analogous to that which under Honorius had shown itself so hostile to the barbarians and to their interference in the affairs of the Empire. This current was favoured at Constantinople. The Rome of the East was less enmeshed in barbarism: thanks to transmissions of one kind or another there had been maintained there a kind of legitimacy. Unfortunately these belated aspirations of Roman patriotism struck upon realities which were too strong for them. All the barbarian elements that were established opposed them: Genseric in Africa, with his incessant piracy and his diplomatic intrigues; the Visigoths in Gaul with their profound conviction that in the Empire they belonged to the family, whether as protectors or in the capacity of heirs; there were

[1] *Chron. Min.* loc. cit., p. 304. The deposition of Avitus took place October 18, 456: he had been acclaimed in Gaul on July 10, 455, and at Rome on September 21 following.

none even including the Burgundians, who did not seek to play a part by thrusting themselves into high military employment. But the gravest danger was in the very midst of Italy, in the army called Roman, in which there were hardly any longer any but barbarian contingents. Out of these bands, still unconscious of their possible future, let an enterprising leader but succeed in constituting a national body analogous to that of the Visigoths and the Vandals, and the Empire was done with, in Italy just as much as elsewhere. This is what happened under Odoacer, twenty years after the death of Valentinian III. Ricimer played the prelude, to some extent, to this great change. He remained till his death in 472 the real master of Italy, without, however, daring to give himself the position of King or of Emperor. The latter devolved at first on Majorian, on April 1, 457, after an interregnum of nearly six months. The choice was not a bad one: Majorian made some efforts with a view to internal reform, showed himself in Gaul and in Spain, and prepared a landing in Africa. His expedition failed: Ricimer, disturbed by so much activity, deposed the Emperor (August 2, 461) and caused him to be put to death (August 7).

He replaced him by a certain Libius Severus (November 19), who filled the post until his death on September 15, 465. Then, still recoiling before the impossibility of encircling with the imperial and Catholic diadem the forehead of an Arian barbarian, he came to terms with Constantinople and left the Emperor Leo to give himself a Western colleague. It was Anthemius who was chosen. On April 12, 467, he was received and proclaimed in Rome. He was a man of some worth, not too unworthy of his grandfather, that Anthemius who during the minority of Theodosius II. had directed the affairs of the Eastern Empire.[1] To ensure the *entente* Anthemius gave his daughter to Ricimer. It was a vain precaution! Four years had not elapsed before the son-in-law, alarmed at the activity of his father-in-law, revolted against him. Anthemius defended himself better than Majorian. Being attacked in Rome itself, he offered a resistance of considerable vigour: none the less he was vanquished and slain (July 11, 472). Ricimer's army carried the Trastevere, forced the bridges, and spread itself through the city. For the third time Rome knew the horrors of pillage.

[1] *Supra*, p. 201.

Ricimer died shortly afterwards (September 18). With him had come a new Emperor, Olybrius, of the Anician family, the husband of the younger Placidia. Olybrius had been for a considerable time Genseric's candidate; for Genseric had a candidate—a melancholy sign of the misery into which things had fallen. Olybrius lasted only a few weeks.[1] He had had time to nominate as Patrician a Burgundian King, Gondebaud, who, succeeding to the functions of Ricimer, presided for some time over the destinies of Italy. On March 3, 473, by the efforts of this barbarian chief a new Emperor, Glycerius, was proclaimed at Ravenna. But at Constantinople, where they had recognized neither Olybrius nor Glycerius, they had made up their minds, though taking their time about it, to replace Anthemius. The candidate chosen, Julius Nepos, landed at Ravenna, was proclaimed and marched upon Rome. Glycerius, who was overtaken at Portus, was consecrated bishop and despatched to Salona, where the new Emperor had a very strong position. On June 24, 474, he was acclaimed in Rome. He was also proclaimed in Gaul: he was the last Emperor in whose name anyone fought or negotiated in that country.

After Majorian and Anthemius, Nepos still represented the imperial tradition: this did not suit the interests of the barbarians in Italy. The latter, under the orders of a Patrician, Orestes, who was none the less of Roman blood, made no delay in overthrowing the Emperor who had been sent to them from the East. Nepos being attacked in Ravenna fled to Dalmatia (August 28, 475), where he maintained himself for five years longer. Orestes gave the Empire to his son, a minor, Romulus Augustulus, under whose name he planned to reign (October 31).

But the time had come; the barbarian army was speedily excited against a prince who was a child and a government which still preserved certain Roman aims. Odoacer, a German of some Danubian tribe, was placed at its head (August 23, 476); with it he entered Pavia, where Orestes was captured and slain, and then Ravenna. He allowed the young Augustulus to live, and sent him to the mansion of Lucullus near Naples (Castel dell' Uovo), where he provided him with a pension. So ended the Roman Empire. Genseric could die in peace in his Africa: no one was any longer in a position to disturb his heirs there.

[1] He died in Rome, October 23, 472.

The Visigoths annexed whatever might still exist of Roman Spain, and, in Gaul, the country to the south of the Durance together with the illustrious city of Arles; the rest of the valley of the Rhône was already in or then passed into the hands of the Burgundians.

In Italy the cessation of the Empire seems not to have been felt very deeply. If anyone regretted it, he did so for sentimental reasons. A barbarian king was installed at Ravenna, in the palace of the Emperors of the West. He replaced them—that was all. Otherwise there was no change either in the army or in the machinery of administration. And people had the satisfaction of feeling themselves in tranquillity, at peace with the barbarians without and with those within. Odoacer governed his Italy down to the year 488. It was only then that there was seen appearing on the Isonzo the Ostrogothic horde with its chief Theodoric, son of Valamir. Established for a long time in Pannonia, the Eastern Goths had ended by coming to terms with Constantinople. In the early years of Zeno, two of their bands, each commanded by a chief named Theodoric, had given much trouble to the armies, the diplomacy, and above all to the finances of the Greek Empire. At last one of the Theodorics, Theodoric the Squinter, having died by accident, they had been able to come to an understanding with the other, Theodoric the Amal, destined to become Theodoric the Great. It was he who formed the plan of going to conquer Italy against Odoacer, for the benefit of the Empire. Zeno was in favour of this enterprise which rid him of guests of a very irksome kind. Odoacer defended himself: it took three years to hunt him down in Ravenna. Theodoric, when he had him in his hands, caused him to be slain and installed himself in his place in 493. The two armies coalesced. The system inaugurated by Odoacer was maintained and perfected by the Ostrogothic chief. With the simple title of King he was in command of all the settled barbarians and exercised in respect of the Roman population the functions of a Vice-Emperor. The Romans were excluded from the army, the barbarians from civil employments; the legislative power, the right of coining money, the imperial insignia and titles, were reserved to the sovereign of Constantinople. The Goths[1]

[1] This term must not be taken in too strict an ethnic sense: it designates the whole population of Germanic or assimilated stock.

had a third of the lands; the rest was guaranteed to the Romans. The latter found in Theodoric a prince shrewd, intelligent, devoted to his duties, who harassed them neither in their religion nor in their interests, and by respecting so far as possible the old forms, the old institutions, above all by flattering the Roman Senate, knew even how to soften any regrets that might have been left by the disappearance of the Empire.

Rome had become entirely Christian. Only a few families of the aristocracy still retained some adepts of the ancient cult. Symmachus, Prefect of Rome in 419, he who had to intervene in the rival candidature of Eulalius and Boniface, was a survivor of paganism. Volusianus, uncle of Melania the younger, was also in the same position when he was sent to Constantinople in 436 to negotiate the marriage of Valentinian III. with the daughter of Theodosius II. Over him, however, the fervent piety of his niece kept watch, and he was baptized in the hour of death by the Patriarch Proclus.

Of the ancient cult there no longer subsisted anything save a few popular amusements like the sports of the Lupercalia on February 15: this species of Carnival lasted down to the time of Pope Gelasius (492-496), who succeeded in procuring its suppression.[1]

The temples were closed, but they remained standing, impressive witnesses of the old state of things. No one thought any more either of demolishing them or certainly of appropriating them to Christian use. It was only with the ravages of time, sometimes with the depredations of the barbarians, that they had to reckon. The crowds who flocked to them in bygone days now thronged the churches. The latter were being multiplied in the city and in the suburbs. To the old "conventicula" of the time before the Great Persecution, to the splendid memorials built by Constantine and his family, many new edifices were added in the course of the 4th century. There is hardly a Pope, at that time, whose name is not attached to a church. Men spoke of the Basilicas of Silvester, of Marcus, Julius, Liberius, Damasus.[2] Their

[1] A senator named Andromachus having presumed to protest against this suppression, Gelasius justified it in a memoir of a certain liveliness (*Adv. Andromachum*; Thiel, *Epp. Rom. Pont.*, p. 598).

[2] Vol. II., p. 356.

successors were not less active in this respect. The name of Siricius is met with in several churches, on inscriptions commemorating important works: Anastasius during his short pontificate had had time to found one, the Basilica Crescentiana, which we cannot succeed in identifying. Under Innocent, a matron, Vestina, constructed another (S. Vitale) on the southern flank of the Quirinal; under Celestine and Xystus III., an Illyrian priest, Peter, founded on the Aventine that of Sabina, still standing in its essential parts.

About the same time two churches on the Esquiline, that of the Apostles and that of Liberius, were rebuilt and embellished. The first had as its minister, in the time of Pope Celestine, a priest, Philip, who was sent as a legate to the Council of Ephesus and to Constantinople. He succeeded in interesting the Court of the East in the sacred edifice of which he had the charge: the Church "of the Apostles" was restored at the cost of Theodosius II., his wife Eudocia, and their daughter Eudoxia. The name of the last, who became Empress of the West, remained attached to it, as also did the memory of the legate to Ephesus.[1] But it was above all the Liberian Basilica, restored by Pope Xystus III., which was called to be the memorial of the famous council. Xystus dedicated it to Mary. It is with the exception, not quite a clear one,[2] of Ephesus, the most ancient church of this title.[3]

The greater part of these churches were served permanently by priests and readers whose position in relation to the faithful of their district and under the authority of the bishop answered well enough to what was later the condition of the parochial clergy. These establishments bore the name of *tituli*. Outside the city the Basilica of St Peter, founded by Constantine, and that of St Paul, restored by Valentinian II and Theodosius, were the principal centres of attraction. But there were others. Each of the Roman roads counted several

[1] PRESBYTERI TAMEN HIC LABOR EST ET CVRA PHILIPPI
POSTQVAM EFESI CHRISTVS VICIT VTRIQVE POLO

says Pope Xystus in the dedicatory inscription (De Rossi, *Inscr. Christ.* ii., p. 110).

[2] *Supra*, p. 244, note 2.

[3] Xystus III. also renewed the baptistery of the Lateran: his building is still standing in part and one can read there the famous dedication *Gens sacranda polis*, etc.

Christian cemeteries. There, over the tombs of the martyrs, churches were reared in great numbers, some of them sumptuous, others modest, some plunged to a greater or less degree in the depths of the earth. Even in passages dark and difficult of access the faithful delighted to adorn and to visit the holy tombs, pointed out to their piety by the fine inscriptions of Pope Damasus and his imitators, often too by the original epitaphs. More than the churches of the city these holy places "without the walls" attracted the devotion of pilgrims. They formed around Rome, as it were, a crown of sanctuaries, far renowned, almost equally with the pilgrimage to Palestine.

The central establishment was always at the Lateran. There was to be found the bishop's house with all the offices of the administration and the principal baptistery, rebuilt under Xystus III. It was from thence that the Pope governed his local church, that is to say almost all the Roman population. The pagans had disappeared, the heretics had become rare. Of Donatists no more was heard: besides there could not be any except immigrants from Africa. Of the schisms of Lucifer, Ursinus, Eulalius, the trace was rapidly vanishing. Only the Novatians held their ground some time longer. Theirs was an indigenous sect, of considerable numbers: it recommended itself by its comparative orthodoxy, for, apart from the original dissidence on the penitential question its members were in everything else of the same views as in the Catholic Church. The Novatians had a bishop and several churches. Pope Celestine instigated the closing of them, as Cyril had done at Alexandria. The Novatian bishop Rusticulus saw himself reduced to celebrating his worship in the secrecy of private houses. This rigour contrasted with the toleration which these dissenters enjoyed at Constantinople. "The fact was," says the historian Socrates, always favourable to the Novatians, "that the Bishops of Rome and Alexandria had long been attributing to themselves an authority more than sacerdotal."[1]

This is the last news that we have of the Novatians of Rome. There is reason to believe that they were not slow to

[1] Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 11. The expression is justified: in Italy, in Gaul, in Africa, in Spain, at any moment the secular authority was to be found at the service of the Roman Church, and that since the time of Pope Damasus.

merge themselves in the Catholic confession from which their own was so little distinguished.

Less easy to overcome and especially to assimilate was the sect of the Manicheans.[1] Proscribed since the time of Diocletian, reduced to the condition of a secret society, it had never ceased to gain recruits. In Africa especially, where the laws against dissenters were suffered to sleep more than elsewhere, there were many Manicheans, and they scarcely disguished the fact that they were so. Augustine in his youth had been one of them. He spent nine years among them, not in the higher rank of the *Elect* but in the common "observance" of the *Hearers* (*auditores*). The Elect, who included members of either sex, professed a continence which was absolute and a great austerity of life. They had no fixed residence; their special character compelled them to transfer themselves continually from one country to another to preach the doctrine. Augustine who had seen them at close quarters, at Carthage and at Rome, did not hold them in high esteem: he tells in regard to them stories not of an edifying character[2] and even goes so far as to say that all those whom he had known had either been surprised in guilt or strongly suspected. Once converted, he displayed much zeal against his former co-religionists: he discussed their doctrines, their sacred books, their treatises of apologetic. If opportunity for it offered he entered into public debate with them.[3] Whatever might be his gentleness and the amenity of his proceedings the dualists had much trouble with such a dialectician. He abstained moreover from attacking them more than was right. He was heard one day to declare that in the religious assemblies of the Manicheans there did not take place, to his knowledge, anything improper.[4] But this testimony only concerns the assemblies of the Hearers, the only ones in which he had taken part. It in no wise guaranteed those of the

[1] Vol. I., p. 404. *Cf.* E. de Stoop, *Essai sur la diffusion du Manichéisme en Occident* (Gand, 1909).

[2] *De moribus Manichaeorum*, 67-75.

[3] The anti-Manichean works of St Augustine are collected in vol. viii. of his works in the Benedictine edition (Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, xlii.); *cf.* Vienna *Corpus*, vol. xxv. Specially to be noted are the thirty-three books against Faustus, a Manichean Bishop whom St Augustine knew personally, and the formal records of his public debates with Fortunatus and Felix.

[4] *Contra Fortunatum*, 3.

Elect: various facts of a well-attested kind prove that abominable things sometimes took place there. To set free the particles of light or of divinity which are detained in the material world and which generation tends unceasingly to hold in captivity there, this was the fundamental duty of every Manichean. To this attached practices of a disgusting, indescribable character. When Augustine wrote his book on *The Nature of the Good* (*c.* 405), these disorders had been judicially proved, with the confession of the guilty, in Paphlagonia and in Gaul.[1] They were established also shortly afterwards (421) at Carthage itself[2] in an enquiry conducted by a representative of the Emperor, the tribune Ursus. The Bishop of Hippo was among the investigators.

At Rome the first outcry of this kind took place in 443 in the time of Pope Leo. In the days when Augustine, still a young man, was frequenting Manichean meetings there[3] it does not appear that they had been greatly disturbed. But the scandals of which I have just spoken and the polemics of Augustine must have aroused feelings of disquiet. The Vandal invasion and especially the occupation of Carthage had caused many Africans to transfer themselves to Italy: from this fact came a considerable reinforcement of the Manichean community in Rome. Rumours came to the ears of Leo, a watchful shepherd if ever there were one. He made enquiry: on his information the police arrested all the Manichean Elect, including their bishop. This done, the formal enquiry began. The Pope gave it great publicity; it took place in presence not only of bishops and priests but also of high officials and of a large number of members of the Senate.[4] The accused confessed: even children were made to appear, a little girl of ten and an adolescent, implicated in ritual infamies. Formal detailed records were drawn up and signed, notably by the Manichean bishop. The heretics who repented were admitted to penance, the others condemned by

[1] *De Natura Boni*, 47.

[2] Possidius, *Vita Augustini*, 16; *De haeresibus*, 46; cf. *Praedestinatus*, 46.

[3] It is about this time that the Ambrosiaster (Isaac, a converted Jew, *cf.* Vol. II., p. 371) was writing: he speaks of them fairly frequently in his various works. See especially his commentary on 2 Tim. iii. 6-7; iv. 3-4.

[4] *Coram senatu amplissimo*, says the law of Valentinian III.: *Christianis viris ac nobilibus congregatis*, says Leo himself (*Serm.* 16).

the judges to perpetual banishment. Some, however, escaped, among others a certain Pascentius who took refuge in Spain, where he was discovered some years later by the Bishop of Emerita.[1]

The enquiry had hardly ended when Leo, in a discourse of great emotion,[2] informed his flock of the facts. He also warned the Bishops of Italy[3] and, broadly speaking, of all Christendom, communicating to them the official records of the proceedings. In the houses of the Manicheans of Rome they had seized lists of *personnel* which enabled the chiefs of the heresy[4] to be identified almost everywhere. The Emperor Valentinian by a rescript addressed to the Prætorian Prefect Albinus[5] renewed, with a reference to the recent occurrences, the laws passed against the Manicheans since "pagan times." He refrained, however, from putting into force again the terrible penalty of burning inflicted by Diocletian, and confined himself to ordaining legal incapacities and exclusions from residence.

This affair made much stir: the sect went to earth. From time to time we still find mention of Manicheans discovered and punished.[6] Their books were burnt, and the sectaries exiled. An ordinance, attributed to St Augustine,[7] shows the difference made by experts between the Hearers and the Elect. The first were made to sign a very explicit condemnation of Manes and his principal doctrines, then they were admitted to penance or to the catechumenate, according as they had or had not received baptism in their sect.[8] As for the Elect they were treated as almost incapable of conversion; it was only after having made long proof of them in monasteries or other ecclesiastical establishments that they accepted their return to a better mind.

[1] Hydatius, *Chron.* 448.

[2] *Sermon* 16, pronounced for the Fast of December; *cf. Serm.* 9, 24, 34, 42.

[3] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 405; *Ep.* vii.

[4] Prosper, *Chron.* ad ann. 443; Hydatius, *Chron.* 445; Theodoret, *Ep.* 113.

[5] *Novellae Valentin.* xviii., June 19, 445.

[6] At Carthage, in the time of Huneric (*supra*, p. 437); at Rome, *Liber Pontificalis*, Lives of Gelasius, Symmachus, Hormisdas.

[7] Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, xlii., p. 1153; Vienna *Corpus*, vol. xxv., p. 979.

[8] Despite the enormity of their heresy the baptism of the Manicheans was considered as valid.

Against the Pelagians who had been smitten with so many anathemas and proscriptions there was scarcely any further struggle in Rome, except in the field of literary controversy. They are hardly referred to in the sermons of St Leo. It is in some special books[1] that there are dealt with, doubtless for a fairly limited public, the questions of grace, free-will, and original sin. It was not at Rome, it was in the country of Aquileia, in Venetia, that the Pelagians still found, if not great success, at least a certain toleration. A bishop of this province, Septimus of Altinum, informed Pope Leo of it. The latter energetically reminded the metropolitan of Aquileia of his duty, ordering him not to receive priests who took refuge with him in order to escape the reprobation which, in their own dioceses, their heretical opinions had secured for them. He was to call the provincial council, and to obtain from suspected persons retractations of the most explicit kind. Thirty years or so after Leo Pelagianism was still giving trouble to his successors. Pope Gelasius wrote[2] against this heresy which, so he was told, was spreading itself in Dalmatia.[3] These rumours were denied; but there was brought to the Pope an old man named Seneca who was preaching in Picenum the doctrine of Pelagius. This gave him an opportunity to administer a grave admonition[4] to the bishops of this region.

The Eastern controversies on the Incarnation had a certain reverberation in the Roman population, for Nestorius and Eutyches held an important place in the preaching of Leo. Nestorius figures there rather for reasons of symmetry: it was Eutyches who was the more to be feared, and moreover a Eutyches of a very vague kind. Alexandrian commerce was always bringing to Rome a large number of Egyptians who did not fail to get themselves talked about; they defended the acts of violence to which, in their country, recourse was had against anyone who upheld the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo. It needed a good deal of effrontery to come to Rome

[1] The *De Vocatione omnium gentium* and the *Hypomnesticon* which have been referred to above, p. 200, note 2. These works have been attributed to Pope Leo.

[2] *Tract.* v. (Thiel, *Epp. Pont. Rom.*, p. 571).

[3] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 625, 626. The first bears an altered date, *Fausto v. c. cons.* (490): Gelasius was not yet Pope. I should conjecture *it. p. c. Fausti v. c. cons.* which would give the year 492.

[4] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 621.

itself and treat the Pope as a heretic; but the Egyptians were *capables de tout.* Leo devoted to them a special sermon[1] delivered in the Church of Anastasia in proximity to the mercantile quarter which they frequented. It was against them too that there was written the Dialogue between Arnobius and Serapion[2] in which the dogma of the Two Natures is vigorously defended.

It was in this way that from all sides the Roman Pontiffs confronted heresy and hindered it from creeping into their Church. Disguised or not, the sects did not succeed in escaping their vigilance.

When, in 467, the Emperor Anthemius came to install himself at Rome, one of his associates, Philotheus, who belonged to the "Macedonian" confession, wished to make use of his influence in order to secure toleration for the dissenters. It was lost labour. Pope Hilary taking advantage of a visit of the Emperor to the Vatican Basilica, addressed him without any circumlocution and made him swear that he would respect the unity of the Roman Church.[3]

This unity, however, was not absolute. From the time that Ricimer was master at Rome and in Italy it had been quite necessary to admit the confession of Ariminum, the Arians—to speak plainly. At Constantinople where the same necessity made itself felt, the Arian churches were all situated outside the enclosure of Constantine, in the peripheral zone which was called the *Exokionion*[4]; at Rome Ricimer had caused one to be built in the very centre of the city, on the Quirinal, at the place where this hill slopes towards the Suburra,[5] and it was certainly another bishop than Pope Hilary, an Arian bishop, who had dedicated it and who celebrated in it.[6] This

[1] *Serm.* 96.

[2] *Supra*, p. 198. Very zealous against the heresies of the East the author of this dialogue had probably had some difficulty in putting himself, on the questions of grace and original sin, upon the same line as Pope Leo.

[3] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 664; Gelasius, *Ep.* 26, c. 11. [4] *Supra*, p. 202.

[5] S. Agata dei Goti. The dedicatory inscription, *Fl. Ricimer v. i. magister utriusq. militiae patricius et ex cons. ord. pro voto suo adornavit*, was still read by Baronius (*Martyr. Rom.*, February 5) below the mosaic of the apse.

[6] There was at that time, or there had been later, another church at Rome, near the *domus Merulana* on the Esquiline (Greg. Magni, *Reg.* iii. 19).

position continued until after the Gothic War. The Pope had at Rome a dissenting colleague; that is why we find him signing "Bishop of the Catholic Church of Rome," or "Bishop of the Catholic Church," just as St Augustine when provided at Hippo with a Donatist colleague signed "Bishop of the Catholic Church of Hippo," or simply "Bishop of the Catholic Church."

To this last formula there was attributed later a very wide significance: use was made of it to describe the authority of the Roman Church over the whole of Catholic Christendom. At the time that we have reached, the formula did not apply itself to the function; but the function was exercised without formula. The Roman Pope had his eye upon the whole Church: nothing serious happened in it without his devoting his attention to it, without his feeling that his responsibility was involved and intervening, in case of need, to the fullest possible extent.

This position, when the need was felt to verify the titles to it, was based upon tradition, upon earlier relations, upon the sentiment of the unity of the Church, upon the necessity of an organ for this unity, finally upon the texts of the New Testament in which the *rôle* of St Peter appeared so clearly special and superior. At Rome it would not have been admitted that it was derived from the ordinances of Councils: they left to others the idea of invoking the Empire and its institutions. Nevertheless, taking things as a whole, above the imperial rescripts, the prestige emanating from the sovereign and his Court, there was an old and fundamental conception which attached the whole *Orbis Romanus* to the City of the Seven Hills, to the "Eternal City" as it was called. Outside its Empire there was to be seen only barbarism, more or less bizarre, more or less shaped, in any case morally subordinate to the essential civilization, that of the Mistress of the World. From this there resulted for Christian Rome, apart from or in spite of all canonical rights, a consideration incapable of definition which upheld the tradition of religion. This sentiment is admirably expressed in the homily[1] in which Pope Leo compares the ancient splendour of Rome and its Christian position, takes into account what it owes to Peter and Paul without disregarding what comes to it from Romulus and Remus.

[1] *Sermo* 82, *in Natali apostolorum Petri et Pauli.*

To a less degree than at Rome this sentiment, more or less thought out, lived everywhere in the Church and manifested itself on occasion, even if circumstances a little contradicted it. In the East two centrifugal tendencies are to be noticed: first, the influence of conflicts which diminish respect and end in separations, temporary it is true, but calculated to give rise to troublesome customs; next the influence of local organizations which, by providing on the spot for ecclesiastical requirements, reduced considerably the relations with the Holy See. In the 5th century the latter was frequently at variance with the East. Hardly had it emerged from the thorny question raised by the Antiochene schism, when there presented itself that of St John Chrysostom. Then was broken, for the first time, the traditional alliance of Rome and Alexandria, and Alexandria succeeded in setting on its side almost the whole of the Greek Episcopate. It needed time for relations to be renewed. The disagreement began again in connexion with Eutyches and Dioscorus, and this time there was an end of good relations with Egypt. The century closes with the schism in regard to Acacius and this schism extends to the whole Empire of the East. More serious still, more fatal to the preservation of ecclesiastical unity, is the foundation of a kind of Greek Papacy at Constantinople, favoured by the separation of the two Empires and by the diversity of language. In the one place Latin was spoken, in the other Greek: here they appealed to the Emperor of Constantinople, there to the Emperor of Ravenna. In the Eastern Empire the churches are thenceforward rich enough to have no need of Roman help, sufficiently enlightened and organized hierarchically to suffice for all their necessities without asking for advice from the old metropolis. It needed very serious conflicts, very special cases, to make anyone think of having recourse to it.

Such cases, however, occurred from time to time. It happened sometimes that the ecclesiastical *ultima ratio* of the East, the decision of the "œcumenical" council, aroused protests, and that these protests were addressed to Rome. Rome intervened, succeeded in making its judgement prevail, or at any rate formally reserved right against the momentary triumph of force. The sentence passed against Chrysostom by the Council of the Oak and the Bishop of Alexandria was

annulled, on an implicit appeal, by Pope Innocent. Despite all efforts at resistance even by Theophilus and Cyril, this annulment in the end achieved its effect. If Nestorius falls from the See of Constantinople, it is much less because Cyril has condemned him than because Rome has not upheld him. In this involved discussion, the agreement which was established in the end was not produced without the intervention of Pope Xystus III. The second Council of Ephesus was annulled by Pope Leo, on a definite appeal and also on the report of his legates. It is Leo who makes peace in the East and who regulates, whether by his letter to Flavian or by his legates at the Council of Chalcedon, the terms of the dogmatic agreement. Of his intervention the trace will remain during two centuries, in the resistance which it awakened, in the long struggle maintained to defend the Roman Tome and the Council of Chalcedon. One might, at various moments of these conflicts, reproach the Popes or their representatives with being imperfectly informed, with not having succeeded in understanding certain local necessities, with having failed in flexibility in the exercise of their authority; one could not reproach them with too weak a sense of their duties or too little readiness to conform to it. If they did not always succeed, we must take into account the difficulty in which they were placed, as Latins, in making themselves understood by Greeks, even in understanding the subtilities in which was involved, at so great a distance from them, the Christian tradition; themselves subjects of the Italian Empire, in winning over the Byzantine Court, canvassed from near at hand by rival influences. To sum up, it would have been difficult, given the circumstances, to do more than they did, I do not say to make their authority prevail—such was not their main concern—but to make it serve the welfare of the Eastern Church.

I am not speaking here, as may be seen, of a simple primacy of rank and of honour. That went without saying, and no one in the East has ever disputed this kind of pre-eminence to the apostolic pontiffs. One may well imagine that in the West respect for the Holy See must have been greater still and that relations with it must have been far more frequent.

Here, however, there were many diversities. It was far from

being the case that all parts of this enormous jurisdiction were in uniform relations with the Apostolic See. Around Rome the churches of peninsular Italy and of the islands formed a first group, watched over and directed from quite close at hand. One may compare it with the Patriarchate of Alexandria, although the latter only included about a hundred bishops and the Pope had almost two hundred of them under his immediate jurisdiction. Like the Patriarch of Alexandria, the Pope presided over the recruiting of his episcopal *personnel*. Doubtless he did not intervene in the elections. They took place in the church which was to be supplied, under the direction of the neighbouring bishops. But the bishop-elect had to present himself at Rome, with a formal record of his election and some representatives of the clergy and the faithful laity. The Pope verified the regularity of the proceedings in the election and the suitability of the person chosen: after this he proceeded to the ordination. Such was the practice which had been arrived at in pursuance of the principle laid down by Pope Siricius that no bishop ought to be ordained apart from the Apostolic See.

Thus recruited, the episcopate of the pontifical province met from time to time in council. There were always at Rome, as at Constantinople, a certain number of bishops who had come there on business. By adding to them the bishops of the vicinity it was easy, at all times, to have an assemblage of bishops of a quite impressive kind. But there was one moment in the year when the Pope was wont to collect his suffragans around him: it was the anniversary of his consecration as bishop (*natale ordinationis*). There was no general summons: people came on personal invitation. In this way the Pope found himself in contact with the bishops whom it was important for him to see, whether in order to take their advice, or more often to give advice to them and to keep them under his guidance. That was well understood: the Pope's suffragans were very well disciplined, their administration spiritual and temporal, their behaviour and that of their clergy watched from very close quarters. There was a bishop in each city, and the cities being very numerous their territories were often rather small. To put an end to one source of conflicts it had been laid down that no rural church could be founded without authorization of the Holy See. One may judge, from this

feature, of the state of dependence in which this episcopal body existed.

Quite different were the relations outside the pontifical province. Here no comparison is possible with the patriarchates of the East. The Patriarch of Alexandria was wont to consecrate all his bishops, the Patriarchs of Antioch and Constantinople all their metropolitans. The Pope of Rome, outside the Suburbicarian province, did not concern himself in any way with the recruiting of the Episcopate. That was the business of the ecclesiastical authorities of the provinces: the metropolitans or "deans" (in Africa) presided over the ordinations of their suffragans; the suffragans provided for the vacancy of the metropolitical church, sometimes with the assistance of a neighbouring metropolitan.[1]

To the authority of the Pope over the churches of the West there corresponded no conciliar organization. There was not a Council of the West.[2] It was only occasionally that bishops who were strangers to the Suburbicarian province were present at Roman councils. Thus there was no real influence upon the choice of bishops, no regular means of putting oneself into relation with them: the superior government of the Pope was not really organized. When he was asked for advice he gave it, he sent some decretal letter, appropriate to the circumstance. Did persons arrive with complaints, he listened to them; and if it seemed opportune, he intervened in their business. In this class of matters it sometimes happened that, for lack of information on the other side, some complaints were too readily received; and this had disadvantages.

There is considerable likelihood that the Popes were conscious of the imperfection of this system. They would have liked to be better informed. This concern is not unconnected with the

[1] The custom established itself in Upper Italy that the two metropolitans of Milan and Aquileia should consecrate one another. The ceremony took place in the church to be supplied. The metropolitan of Ravenna, always considered as suffragan to Rome, was in this capacity consecrated at Rome by the Pope.

[2] The Council of Arles in 314 is an imperial council, convoked by Constantine. The Council of Aquileia (381), also convoked by the Emperor, is a partial council: Rome took no part in it. As for the Councils of Sardica (342), of Rome (382), of Capua (391), they were in law or, if we like, in the intention which determined the holding of them œcumenical councils.

establishment of apostolic vicariates, fostered by several Popes, with a success, it must be added, of a very relative kind. Siricius had founded the Vicariate of Thessalonica to give expression to the claims of the Roman Church upon Eastern Illyricum. The services that the institution rendered, from this point of view, were mediocre enough; but the result was complete failure when it was desired to transform it into an organ of ecclesiastical government, into a kind of lieutenancy of the Pope above the bishops of these provinces. The latter admitted that the Pope was their superior; but they had no fancy at all for his vicar. Pope Zosimus made trial of the same system for his relations with Gaul: he also failed. It is astonishing that such experiences should not have hindered the subsequent Popes from trying the vicarial system again. Simplicius gave letters of vicariate to the Bishop of Seville[1]: it is not clear for what purpose and above all with what success.

It was in Africa only that the West saw the success of an institution analogous to the Greek patriarchates, an ecclesiastical magistracy superior to that of the metropolitans and of the provincial councils. The Bishop of Carthage, with the General Council of Africa, offers to us a remarkable type of regional organization. With the Greek patriarchates it has in common an interprovincial grouping round a Mother-Church. But the Bishop of Carthage had not over his colleagues so strong an authority as the Patriarchs of Alexandria or of Constantinople. In Africa the recruiting of the Episcopate was directed by the Dean of the Province, without the Archbishop of Carthage intervening in it the least bit in the world: the Dean himself is appointed by seniority of office. At Constantinople, at Alexandria, at Antioch, at Jerusalem, it is the bishop of the Patriarchal See who is the important factor in the system: in Africa it is the General Council. But this Council, assembled periodically, in general every year, was a powerful instrument of union, of concentration, of ecclesiastical

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 590. In the 6th century these letters were often delivered to the Bishops of Arles, accompanied by sending to them the pallium. They were honorific distinctions, nothing more. The same must be said of the grants of this kind made by Pope Hormisdas to John, Bishop of Elche (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 786-788, *cf.* 828), and to Sallustius of Seville (*ibid.* 855, 856).

life. Unfortunately, the Vandal invasion broke it before it had been able to yield all that they had a right to expect from it.

But as for this organization of the Church in Africa, it is not to Rome that honour must be paid for it. The Roman Church has taken centuries to understand that when one recognizes oneself as depositary of an œcumenical authority one must prepare for exercising it. The first thing to do would have been to take account of the position for which one was responsible. I greatly fear that in the 5th century, as for a very long time after,[1] people at Rome had only very vague notions of ecclesiastical geography. The pontifical letters often speak of provinces and of metropolitans. It would seem that they recommend an exact application of the system of Nicæa. However, it was not applied in Italy: in Gaul, the province of Arles, in the form in which the Pope recognized it, scarcely coincided with the civil boundaries. In short, the grouping of the episcopate, the *régime* of the councils, the relations with the Holy See, all this was in the West very little defined. People lived in the conviction that the Pope had general charge of the Western Episcopate, that he was its superior. No one thought of disputing to him the rights which flowed from such a position. This attitude of mind was not impaired by transitory conflicts which arose from lack of regulations or vagueness of documents. One point upon which there was special agreement was that in the controversies, whether doctrinal or other, which were arising at every moment in the East, the Pope was qualified to speak in the name of the whole Latin Church.[2] In matters of this kind people only intervened in order to support him and when he thought it suitable.

In the exercise of their functions or magistracies, the different ecclesiastical authorities, bishops, metropolitans, councils, patriarchs, and the Pope himself were often led to request the support of the civil authorities. For ordinary

[1] The most ancient "Provincials" of the Roman Church only go back to the 12th century. See the *Liber Censuum*, Introduction, p. 36, or the *Mélanges* of the École de Rome, vol. xxiv., p 75.

[2] I say here "of the Latin Church." In the Greek provinces of Illyricum it sometimes happened that Roman directions, in the matter of dogma, were sacrificed to suggestions which came from Alexandria or from Constantinople.

cases, for example for the judicial or administrative assistance, whether of the poor or of the local ecclesiastical community, there had quite early been instituted a corps of advocates, that of the *defensores Ecclesiae* who appeared at Rome from the time of the controversy between Ursinus and Damasus,[1] that is to say about the same time as that of the institution of the *defensores civitatis*. They were often chosen from the ranks of the official *scholastici*, a fact which gave them standing to appear before the magistrates.[2] They served in particular to ensure the execution of ecclesiastical sentences or for citing persons liable to trial on any occasion when resistance might be anticipated, and it was necessary to ask for the concurrence of the public authority. There were bishops who, when cited to appear before their ecclesiastical superiors, obstinately refused to do anything of the kind or who paid no heed to decisions taken with regard to them. So far as concerns obedience to the Holy See, laws were asked for and obtained which obliged governors and other local authorities to employ in case of need material constraint in order to get the better of attempts at resistance. To this class of prescriptions belong the rescript of Gratian to Aquilinus in 378 and that of Valentinian III. to Aetius in 445. We can add to them also the majority of the laws against heretics. The Pope sent his "defensors" almost everywhere, to the East, to Gaul, to Spain, to Africa. In 419 and the following years the African bishops considered that abuse was being made against them of this recourse to the secular arm, and protested with considerable vigour. It was inevitable that in cases of this kind some checks should occur. The system continued none the less. In 465 Pope Hilary annuls a decision of the Council of the Provincia Tarraconensis which had ratified an irregular promotion to Barcelona. He sent to the spot not only a written sentence but also one of his clergy commissioned to secure its execution. As it was a question of removing the bishop irregularly instituted, and as the goodwill of the episcopate of the province could not be presumed, it is plain

[1] *Collectio Avellana* 6; Letter of Valentinian I. to the Prefect of Rome. The Defenders of the Roman Church demand the Liberian Basilica which had been occupied by the schismatics.

[2] For Africa see the general councils of 401 and 407 (*Codex Canonum*, 75, 96, 97), and *Cod. Theod.* XVI. ii. 38; *cf.* Possidius, *Vita Augustini*, 12.

that the Pope's representative was commissioned to call upon the aid of the magistrates.[1]

If the Western Empire had lasted longer, there is no doubt that this system would have been perfected and that notable progress would have been made in ecclesiastical centralization. But soon political frontiers reared themselves between the Pope and the majority of the Latin subjects of his jurisdiction. His requisitions could have no effect either among the Visigoths or among the Vandals. For ordinary cases they continued in Italy where Odoacer and Theodoric maintained in force all the existing institutions which they found. However, there were things which must not be asked of them: it was futile to think of ridding oneself of Arians, of their churches, and of their bishops.

Among the Popes who, in the last century of the Western Empire, presided over the Roman Church and the Universal Church none has left a deeper mark than Leo. His influence was already great in the time of Celestine and of Xystus III. his predecessors, and it was not only in ecclesiastical affairs that it made itself felt. The Government of Placidia estimated very highly his resources of mind and his devotion to the State. At the moment when Xystus III. died, his archdeacon found himself in Gaul engaged in settling a difference which had arisen between Aetius and another great personage, Albinus. The Romans did not want anyone but him for bishop. They had him recalled by an official deputation, and at the end of forty days enthroned him with the greatest enthusiasm.[2]

They were not deceived. The Pope of their choice was to show himself for a period of one-and-twenty years master of circumstances of the greatest gravity. Leo saw Italy a prey to the terrors of Attila, Rome insulted by Genseric. With these two scourges of God he had to go to hold parley, to endeavour to impose upon them some respect for the majesty of the dying Empire. Under his eyes the House of Theodosius collapsed in frightful catastrophes. And in the midst of these convulsions of the State it was necessary for him to keep his mind stretched towards the East where the Faith was incessantly in peril, to struggle there against ecclesiastical

[1] Jaffé, *Regesta*, 560, 561; Thiel, *op. cit.* pp. 165, 169.

[2] Legatione publica accitus et gaudenti patriae praesentatus . . . episcopus ordinatur. Prosper, *Chronicle*, ad ann. 440.

potentates, the violence of the monks, the faction disturbances at Jerusalem and Alexandria, against the platitude of Councils, sometimes against the sovereign himself. His admirable letters, not to speak of external documents, bear testimony to his activity and his wisdom. His sermons of true pontifical eloquence, calm, simple, majestic, show him to us in the midst of his people in the ordinary exercise of his pastoral duty. The passions of the outer world have left there but feeble traces: unshakable in the serenity of his soul, Leo speaks as he writes, as he never ceased to think, to feel, and to act, like a Roman.[1] Hearing him, seeing him at work, the Senators of Valentinian III. must often have thought of their colleagues of the old Republic, those invincible souls whom no trial could cause to quail.

When Leo died on November 10, 461, Ricimer had just rid himself of his first Emperor, Majorian, and replaced him by Severus; but the change was no great one; the barbarian remained what he had been before, the Master. It was an assurance against his fellows in search of adventures; Italy was tranquil enough. In the East the Emperor Leo, after having wavered much, had made up his mind to impose upon the Egyptians respect for the Council of Chalcedon. Peace was made, peace at any rate in the way in which the Pope understood it and desired it. His successor Hilary (461-468) had only to enjoy it. He appreciated it, no doubt, in a very special way, for he had been present at Dioscorus' Council in 449 and knew from personal experience what was meant in

[1] One hardly dares recall that this majestic Pontiff was on occasion capable of turning very elegantly *petits vers*. A priest Felix, the father of the future Pope Felix III., had been commissioned by him in conjunction with a deacon Adeodatus to put in repair the Basilica of St Paul of which the roof had fallen down. They commemorated these works by an inscription in distichs in which the credit of them is given to Pope Leo. But the latter who had no intention of cheating his subordinates caused to be added to the inscription four iambic trimeters, prettily turned, in which he gives back to them the merit of their works.

Laus ista, Felix, respicit te, presbyter,
Necte, levites Adeodate, praeterit:
Quorum fidelis atque pervigil labor
Decus omne tectis ut rediret institit.

The original marble of this double inscription can still be seen in the monastery of St Paul.

the East by theological controversies. Simplicius, who came after him (468-483), had in this respect a moment of alarm, when Basiliscus re-established at Alexandria the aged and fanatical Aelurus. His last moments were troubled by grave anxieties on the subject of Acacius of Constantinople.

This Pope Simplicius, with regard to whom, apart from Greek affairs, we have very little information, is the Pope who saw the end of the Roman Empire of the West. This end, one is almost sorry to say it, was not a catastrophe. Contemporaries scarcely perceived it.

It is not less true that Felix III. (483-492), who replaced Simplicius, found the whole of the West, except for the little kingdom of Syagrius and the far-off Britons, under the authority of heretical sovereigns, one of whom, Huneric, was waging upon Catholicism a war to the death, and the other, Euric, was to say the least very ill-disposed to it. Rome itself was obeying an Arian prince. And it had been necessary to break with the Greek Church! A more deplorable position could not be imagined. But, no more than the Senate of ancient Rome when Hannibal, master of the whole of Italy, was at her gates, had Pope Felix hesitated before his duty. God took his side.

INDEX

Aaron, St, Martyr (*saec.* iv.), 424
Abdiso, Catholicos of Persia, 273
Abitina, 84
Abousir, 332
Abraham, father of Zosimus, 160
Abraham, Persian Christian, 388
Abundantius (*c.* 412), 209
Abundius, Bp. of Como (450-69), 295
Abydos, 358
Abyssinia, Christianity in, 396-400
Acacius, Bp. of Amida (*c.* 420) [386], 387 f.
Acacius, Bp. of Antioch (458-60), successor of Basil, 342
Acacius, Bp. of Berœa (*c.* 379-436), opponent of Chrysostom, 54 f., 62, 64, 67, 69 f., 72, 206, 208; at "The Oak," 62 ff.; vacillation, 208; relations with Cyril, 211, 237, 260 ff.; Letter of, 211; absent from Ephesus (431), 243; represented by Paul of Emesa, 262; letter of Xystus III. to, 259; and of Theodosius II., 260; relations with Persia, 386; death, 264
Acacius, Bp. of Constantinople (471-89), character, 338 f.; relations with Pope Simplicius, 330, 354; interferes in see of Ephesus, 339; and Timothy Aelurus, 338, 344-46; attitude to Council of Chalcedon, 347 f.; inspires the Henotikon, 348; attitude to Peter Mongus, 350 f., 355; his policy, 357 f.; deposed by Pope Felix III. (484), 355-59, 460, 469; *Gesta de Nomine Acacii*, 294, 317, 347
Acacius, Bp. of Melitene (*c.* 431) supports Cyril of Alexandria, 253, 265, 269, 282, 390; eminence as a theologian, 253; attacked by Theodoret, 254
Acacius, Catholicos of Seleucia (485-95 ?), Confession of Faith, 392 f.
Acampsis, River, 362
Acephali: in Egypt, 351; monophysites in Palestine, 317
Achæmenids, 363
Achaia, Province of, 125
Achilleus, Bp. of Spoleto (*c.* 419), 174
Achmin, 310
Acholius, Bp. of Thessalonica (*c.* 380-83), 126
Acilicene, 369
Acœmeti, Akoimetoi, monastery of, 214, 342 f., 355, 358; popularity, 215; doctrinal sympathies, 342, 355, 358; abbots, *see* Cyril, Marcellus
Acolytes, 16
Acts, Apocryphal, in Spain, 404
Adam, sin of, 143 ff., 148; meaning of "the second Adam," 146
Adamantius, 45
Ad duas lauros, 446
Adefas, 398
Adelfius, Bp. of Lincoln, at Council of Arles (314), 424
Adelphius, the Mesopotamian, a founder of the Messalians, 214
Aden, 396, 399
Adeodatus, Roman deacon, 468
Adiabene, 379 ff., 386. *See* Izates
Adoptionism, 123, 230, 235
Adoulis, 396 f.
Adriatic, 125, 130
Adults. *See* Baptism
Ad Vetus, 31, 32 f.
Advocate, 147, 355 f., 358 f., 466. *See* Defensores
Aedesius (*c.* 368) in Abyssinia, 397 f.
Aegeum. *See* John.
Aegidius, in Gaul (*c.* 461-64), 415
Ælia, 326 f. *See* Jerusalem
Aelurus. *See* Timothy
Æmilia, Province of, 129 f.
Æmilius, Bp. of Beneventum (*c.* 405), 182, *cf.* 72
Æneas of Gaza (*c.* 487), 442
Aetius, Archdeacon of Constantinople (*c.* 451), 305
Aetius, Patrician, influence with Galla Placidia, 401; overcomes rivals, 401, 431, 445; military exploits, 402 f., 412 f., 432, 446; relations with Hydatius, 406; with Pope Leo and Hilary of Arles, 411 f., 466; father of Gaudentius, 447; assassination (454) by Valentinian III., 414, 445 f.
Aetius, Bp. of Thessalonica (*c.* 343-44), 126

Africa, provinces, 80, 83, 115, 431 f., 434 f., 444; civil and military officials, 78; economic importance, 85, 108, 432; port of Adoulis, 396 f. Property of Church of Milan in, 148; of Publicola in, 133; of patrician families, 140
Under Constantius, 76, 81; Julian, 76 ff., 93; Valentinian II., 81; rebellion of Count Romanus, 78-81; under Gildo, 82, 84 f., 88 f.; in reign of Honorius, 89, 93 ff., 131, 174, 181, 184; government of Counts Bathanarius, (401-8), 89, 94, Heraclian (409-13), 99, 140, Marinus, 99 f., Pascentius, 121, Boniface, 194 f., 431, Sigisvult and the Goths, 121 f., 194, 431; cruelty of Andronicus, 205; designs of Alaric on, 108 f.; Christian refugees in, 136 ff., 140 ff.; coming of the Vandals, 103, 194 ff., 230, 243, 358, 401 f., 417, 431, 455; captivity of Eudoxia, 328, 331, 447; Vandal rule, 431-44, 447 f., 449; plans of Majorian, 448. *See* Vicarius.
Church of, 207, 230; organization, 18 f., 130, 179, 463 ff.; rich in bishoprics, 241; conciliar system, 81 f., 86 f. (*see also* Councils); collections of Councils, 86 f., 171 f.; condition before 390 A.D., 81; position in 391 A.D., 82. Relations with Donatism, chap. iv., *passim*, 341, 453; with Pelagianism, 141 ff., 146, 148, 150. Appeals from, 20, 389, 466; independence, 169, 179, 389; relations with Rome under Pope Anastasius, 89; under Pope Innocent, 157 ff., 163; under Pope Zosimus, 163-72, 174 f., 180; under Pope Celestine, 178 ff. Attitude to Ariminum and Nicæa, 78; to Homoiousians, 79; to Canons of Sardica, 171 f., 179; Vandal persecution, 431-44; relations with Manicheanism, 454 f.; pilgrimages, 115; only represented by a deacon at Ephesus (431), 243; representatives at Chalcedon, 297. *See also* Augustine, Melania, Orosius; Byzacena, Mauretania, Numidia; Carthage, Fussala, Hippo, etc.
Agannum, 215
Agape, 6, 8
Agapitus, Bp. of Synaos (*saec.* iv.), 395
Agata, S., dei Goti, 458
Agathangelus, 367 ff.
Agileus, St, 443
Agrestius, Bp. of Lugo (*c.* 433), 405
Agricola, Pelagian, 188
Agri-Dagh, 362
Ahuramazda, 394
Aignan. *See* Annianus of Orleans
Aix, position of see, 410, 412; Bp. of, 417. *See also* Lazarus
Aizan, Prince of Axoum (*c.* 356), 398
Ajax the Arian, a Galatian, 406
Ak Palanka, 127
Alamanni, 105, 110, 112
Alani, in Gaul, 106, 138; in Spain, 430; auxiliaries under Aetius, 402
Alaric, the Goth, 51, chap. v. *passim*; auxiliary of Theodosius, 50, 105; relations with Stilicho, 50, 73, 105 ff., 108; plunders Illyrian provinces, 50, 105; and Greece, 105; "Magister Militum," 106; campaigns in Italy, 94, 106, 134, 201; loses battle of Pollentia (402), 73, 106, 134; join Stilicho, 73, 105 f.; sack of Rome (410), 94, 108 f., 140, 413; death (412), 99, 413
Alaric II., son of Euric, King of Visigoths (484-507), 418; *Breviarium* of, 411
Alban, St (*saec.* iii.), 424
Albania, 361, 364, 391
Albi, 117. *See* Diogenianus
Albian, Armenian Bp., 372, 375
Albina, mother of Melania the younger, 132; in Africa, 142; in Palestine, 142, 168, 207
Albinus at variance with Aetius, 467
Albinus, Prætorian Prefect (*c.* 445), 456
Albinus, Cæionius, 132
Albus, 138
Aleppo, 218, 394
Alexander the Great, 363, 385, 399
Alexander, Bp. of Alexandria (313-26), 56
Alexander, Bp. of Antioch (*c.* 414), policy of conciliation, 207 f., 211; appeal to Rome, 250
Alexander, Bp. of Apamea (*c.* 431), 247, 261
Alexander, Bp. of Hierapolis (*c.* 404-35), at Ephesus (431), 247; metropolitan of Euphratesiana, 261; opposition to Cyril, 265; exiled to Egypt, 266 f.
Alexander, Bp. of Thessalonica (*c.* 325), 126
Alexander, a solitary (*saec.* v.), 213 ff.
Alexandria: before Alexander, 385; disliked by Diocletian, 57; Jewish colony at, 209; schools of, 203, 209; Hypatia and Neoplatonism at, 203, 210; opposition to Emp. Marcian, 296; commerce, 457 f.; sailors of (at Constantinople), 61, 65, 338, (at Chalcedon) 290, (at Ephesus) 240, 242; turbulence of people, 329-32, 336, 350, 468; prohibited residence for dispossessed bps., 330, 332. Priscus of Panion at, 329; Chronicle of Zacharias and, 316
Ascetics at, 216; Frumentius at, 398 f.; Novatians at, 453; Tall Brothers at, 39 ff., 66, 118
Church of A. Mother Church of Egypt, 18 ff., 322; attributed to St Mark, 304; dependent bishoprics, 462 f.

Alexandria—*continued*
Commanding position of Bp. (internally), 20, 58, 63, 204, 276, 462 ff., (the "Ecclesiastical Pharaoh") 56, 206, 256, 272; (externally), 239 ff., 277, 279, 283, 300, 322; costliness of system, 260 f., 272; its assertion by Dioscorus, 275; decline of Cyril, 255 f., 272, of Dioscorus, 301, 303, of Timothy Aelurus, 345 f.
Apocrisiarii, 57, 231, 294; "Chancery" of, 244, 290; monks and, 324, 329, 350, 353; Parabolani, 240, 287, 290; collection of Canons, 171, 175 f. *See* Councils
Relations with Antioch, 56, 238 f., 262 ff., 279, 351; with Carthage, 171, 175 f.; with Constantinople, v., 56, 58; (Theophilus and Chrysostom), 52, 58 f., 61, 66, 211, 242; (Cyril and Atticus), 211, 219; (and Nestorius), 229, 231 ff., 236 f., 239, 241 f.; (Dioscorus and Anatolius), 294; (Timothy Aelurus and Anatolius), 333; (Timothy Salofaciol and Acacius), 347; with Cyprus, 41; with Ephesus, 242, 339; with Jerusalem, 238; with Palestine, 41, 390 f.
Relations with Rome (Theophilus and Anastasius), 41, 43; (and Innocent I.), 208, 460 f.; (Cyril and Celestine I.), 234 f., 276; (Cyril and Leo), 317-19; (Dioscorus and Leo), 276 f., 284, 286, 292, 303 f., 322; (Timothy Aelurus and Leo), 333, 335 f.; (Timothy Salofaciol and Leo) 336 f.; (Timothy Salofaciol and Simplicius), 354 f.; (John Talaia and Felix III.), 354 f.
Bishops: Eusebius' list of, 319; sepulchre of, 340, 350; St Mark, 304, 348; Demetrius (*c.* 189-230), 397; Dionysius (247-265), 228, 366; Alexander (313-26), 56; Athanasius (*c.* 326-73), *q.v.*; Peter (373-80), 58; Timothy (380-85), 58; Theophilus (385-412), *q.v.*; Cyril (412-44), *q.v.*; Dioscorus (444-51), *q.v.*; Proterius (451-7), *q.v.*; Timothy Salofaciol (460-82), *q.v.*; John Talaia (482), *q.v.*
Anti-Popes, Pistus (339), 56; Gregory (340), *ib.*; George (356-61), *ib.*; Lucius (367-78), 56, 395; Timothy Aelurus (457-77), *q.v.*; Peter Mongus (477-90), *q.v.*
Theology of, 224 f.; Gnosticism of Clement and Origen, 13; influence of Origen, 28; Theophilus and Origenism, 35, 38 ff.; influence of Athanasius, 224, 231, 260; of Cyril, 145, 185, 224 f., 231 f., 235, 237, 260, 276, 313, 392; Theodoret and, 274; Pope Leo and, 286, 317 f.; monophysitism, 318; attitude of Persia to, 392; influence in Illyricum, 465; the Henotikon and, 348
Buildings, Cæsareum, 210, 332, 350; Church of Quirinus, 332; Serapeum, 329; Tetrapylon, 332; Novatian Churches, 453
Alfius, Bp. of Rhinocorura (*c.* 460), 213
Alfius, priest, 213
Alithius, Bp. of Cahors (*saec.* v.), 117
Alliance, Sons of the, 380
Allies, Armenian, 366; Gothic, 417, 447
Alphabet, 376, 381
Alps, 160, 402, 407, 423; crossed by Alaric, 73, 106, 108, 134; by Radagaisus, 106; by Constantine III., 109; by Attila, 414; boundary of jurisdiction of Milan, 128; bishopric of Trent in, 129; province of Maritime Alps, 161, 410
Altars, 290; Donatist treatment of, 77, 91
Altinum, 132, 413, 457. *See* Heliodorus, Septimus
Alypius, Abp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia (*c.* 458), 212
Alypius, Bp. of Thagaste (*saec.* v.): friend of Augustine, 96, 121, 166, 176, 179, 183; of Jerome, 207; of Pinianus and Melania, 141 f.
Amalek, 41
Amandus, Bp. of Bordeaux († *c.* 432), 115; friend of Jerome and Paulinus, 117
Ambrose, St, Bp. of Milan (374-97): kinsman of Probus, 4; conversion, 128; Bp. of Milan, 4, 127; jurisdiction in N. Italy, 20, 128 f., *cf.* 118; founds see of Como, 128; deposes Leontius of Salona, 124; his deacons, Venerius, 128, and Paulinus, 148; student of Origen, 28; style of his own works, 113; quoted by Pelagius, 152. Conflict with Maximin the Arian, 121, and with Symmachus, 173; relations with Augustine, 86, *cf.* 88; and Felix of Trèves, 118; and Paulinus of Nola, 115; his authority, 118
Ambrosiaster (*saec.* iv.), identity of, 455
Amida, 386; founded by Constantius (*c.* 340), 365; monks in, 340; province of, 375. *See* Acacius
Ammaedara, 85
Ammianus Marcellinus (*saec.* iv.), 4, 76, 78, 80, 373 f., 423
Ammonius Parotes, 39, 42, 66, 215
Amphilochius, Bp. of Side (*c.* 451), 212, 334 f.
Anahid, Temples of, 369
Anaphora, 8
Anastasia, Church of, at Rome, 458
Anastasis, Church of the, at Constantinople, 58; the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, 36, 42

Anastasius, Bp. of Jerusalem (*c.* 458-78), 344, 353
Anastasius I., Pope (*c.* 399-401), dates of, 38, 46, 134; character, 38; attitude to Origenism, 38, 41, 43 f.; to Rufinus, 38, 43 f., 159; relations with Africa, 89; with Thessalonica, 126 f.; Pelagius at Rome under, 145; builds Basilica Crescentiana, 452
Anastasius, Bp. of Thessalonica (*c.* 451), 21, 299
Anastasius, Syrian priest, 228, 250
Anatolius, Bp. of Constantinople (449-58), an Alexandrian, 294; attitude of monks to him, 216; his consecration, 294; attitude of Pope Leo, 294-96, 322, 335; position at Chalcedon, 299, 320, 323, 333; his activity there, 303, 306, 320; his view of Dioscorus, 306, 331; his own views, 333, 336, 338; death, 336
Anatolius, Patrician (*fl.* 440-51), 299
Anchorites, 324. *See also* Solitaries
Ancyra, 320, 435. Bishops: Leontius (*c.* 397), sanctity, 67, attitude to Chrysostom, 67, 69; Theodotus (*fl.* 430-39) at Ephesus (A.D. 431), attitude to Nestorius, 245, supports Cyril, 253, 258; Eusebius (*c.* 445) at Ephesus (A.D. 449), 301, 307, at Chalcedon, 301 f., 307, 321, attitude to Constantinople, 321. *See also* Councils
Andalusia, 194, 402, 430
Andrew, St, Journeys of, 360; Acts of, 404
Andrew, Bp. of Samosata (*c.* 431-34), view of Cyril's theology, 239, 256, 261, 265; Cyril's reply, 239, 261; his orthodoxy, 256; relation to Nestorius, 390
Andromachus, Senator (*saec.* v.), 451
Andronicus, Governor of Africa (*saec.* v.), 205
Angelo, S., Ponte di, 106
Angels, 4, 441; cult of, 10; Faustus of Riez on, 421
Angers. *See* Councils, Thalassius
Angles, 423
Anglo-Saxons, 189, 428
Angoulême. *See* Dynamius
Ani, 369
Anicia Faltonia Proba [114?], 140 f.
Anicia Juliana, 140 f., [151], 168
Anicii, 131, 140, 151, 445 f., 449
Animals, cult of, 10
Annianus of Celeda (*c.* 415), 206
Annianus, Bp. of Orleans (*c.* 451), 413
Anniversary of martyrs, 114; of Pope, 19, 292, 462
Anomœans, 79; in India, 399
Anteopolis, 298
Anteros, Pope (235-36), 160
Anthemius, Emp. (467-72), grandson of Anthemius, Praetorian Prefect, 448; set up by Ricimer, 415, 448; use of British auxiliaries, 416, 420; failure in Africa, 432; relations with Sidonius Apollinaris, 416, 420; and Pope Hilary, 458; death, 448 f.
Anthemius, Prætorian Prefect (*fl.* 405-17), regent for Theodosius II., 201, 448; character, 201; makes Theodosian enclosure, *ib.*; grandfather of Emp. Anthemius, 448
Anthimus, Bp. of Tyana (*c.* 372), consecrates Bp. for Armenia, 374
Anthropomorphism: and Origenism, 32, 40; among Nitrian monks, 38, 40
Antibes, 190
Anti-encyclical of Basiliscus (476), 344 f.
Antinoe. *See* Theodore, Bp. of
Antioch, 358: Greek origin, 385; appreciation of eloquence at, 53, 220, 274; luxury at, 53; Zeno, Vice-Emperor there, 342 f.; court at, 56, 398; exile of Nestorius there, 253, 257, 267; Theophilus Blemmyas there, 398; visit of Sahag (A.D. 363), 372; earthquake (A.D. 458), 341; schools of, 274
Church of A., see of St Peter, 208, 352; centre for Syria, 19, 253, 261, 273; jurisdiction, 250, 268, 275, 291, 464; compared with Alexandria, 56, 241, 319, 322, 353; consecration of dependent metropolitans, 464; pretensions at Ephesus, 247; see of Tarsus and, 258; claims to Cyprus, 250. Relations with Jerusalem, 249-51; N. Italy, 254; Rome, 181, 207 f., 222, 235, 238, 250 f., 259, 334, 341; Constantinople, 208, 211, 309, 319, 343, 357; with Persian Church, 386, 389, 392; Theodoret and, 274, 340. *See* Councils
Ancient theology, 393; Arianism at, 56; Athanasius and, 239; Apollinarianism there, 221-23, 266, *cf.* 278; and Monophysitism, 266, 338, 342 f., 352; Christological views there, 221-25, 227-30, 232, 235, 245; activity of Chrysostom there, 51-53; reputation of Nestorius there, 220; attitude of Eutyches, 277, 283; monks at, 23; asceticism there, 213 f., 216; Simeon Stylites, 216 f.; Aristolaus and A., 259 f., 268; dislike of Origen there, 28; and of Pelagianism, 168, 185, 249; Nicene canons preserved there, 175; Creeds, 262, 264, 372
Bishops: list in Eusebius, 319; Paul of Samosata (260-70), *q.v.*; Meletius (361-81), 237; Flavian (381-404), death and struggle for succession, 70; Porphyry (404-14), 207, 214, 386;

Antioch—*continued*
Alexander (414-20), *q.v.*; Theodotus (420-29), *q.v.*; John (429-41), *q.v.*; Domnus (441-51), *q.v.*; Maximus (451-56 ?), *q.v.*; Basil (456 ?), 335, 341 f.; Acacius (458-60), Martyrius (460-70), 342; Peter the Fuller (471-88), *q.v.*; Julian (471-76), 343; John Codonatus (477), 343, *cf.* 357; Stephen (*c.* 478-80), 343; Calendion (481-85), 343, 351 f.; Severus (512-19), 213; Gregory (569-94), 316
Little Church, 56, 207, 460; death of Evagrius (*c.* 389-92) its bp., 207
Buildings: Cathedral of Constantine, 207; Church of the "Old Believers," 207; of St Barlaam, 343; Monastery of Euprepius, 220; Hippodrome, 53
Antiochus III. the Great, King (B.C. 223-187), 363
Antiochus IV., Epiphanes, King (B.C. 175-164), 327; manner of his death, 443
Antiochus, Bp. of Ptolemais (*c.* 401-7): opposition to Chrysostom, 54, 62, 64, 67, 69, 206; at Synod of the Oak, 62; orator, 54; intervention at Antioch, 70; Isidore of Pelusium on, 206
Antistes, 241; meaning of, 420
Anti-Taurus, 69, 362
Antoninus, Bp. of Emerita (*c.* 444), 404 f., *cf.* 456
Antoninus, Bp. of Ephesus (*c.* 400), 55, 62
Antoninus Honoratus, Bp. of Constantina, (*c.* 437), 436
Antoninus Pius, Emp. (138-61), Wall of, 423, 427; "Itinerary" of, 426
Antony, Bp. of Fussala (*saec.* v.), 177 f., 235
Antony, Bp. of Germa († *c.* 429), 221
Anysius, Bp. of Thessalonica (383), relations with Rome, 72, 126
Apamea, monastery of Theodoret near, 294. *See also* Alexander, John Codonatus
Apatheia, ascetic view of, 151
Aphraates, Bp. in Adiabene (*fl.* 336-45), "the wise Persian," an Assyrian, 379; his Homilies, *ib.*, 381 f., 384 f.; his Christology, 380; as moral censor, 384 f.
Aphrodite, Armenian, 369
Apiarius, African priest (*saec.* v.), excommunicated, 169; appeal to Rome, 169 f.; Zosimus and the African Church, 170-72, 175 f.; fresh excommunication, 178; the Africans and Pope Celestine, 179
Apocalypse, the: influence in cultus, 10, and art, 12; commentary of Tychonius on, 79
Apocrisiarii of Alexandria at Constantinople, 57, [231], [233], 294
Apocryphal Acts, circulated in Spain, 404
Apollinarianism, officially repudiated (*saec.* iv.), 222; traces in spurious letter of Dionysius of Alexandria, 228; Nestorius' fear of, 229, 236, 238; Pope Julius and, 231, 245, 282; Pope Felix and, 231, 245; repudiated by Cyril, 260, 270; development at Antioch, 221 ff., 266, *cf.* 278; in Syria, 340; charged against Eutyches, 278, 282; spurious works in support of it, 231 f., 245, 282
Apollinarians, activities of, 27, 245; at Constantinople, 227, 270, 390; in Armenia, 269 f., 390; in the East generally, 277
Apollinaris, Bp. of Laodicea (*c.* 374-92): his views, 221 ff., 229; heresiarch, 278, 304, 340 f.; veiled circulation of his works, 27
Apostasy: Isidore on, 206; in Africa, 441 ff., 444; in Armenia, 377 f.; in Persia, 388; in Spain, 406
Apostles, reputed journeys of, 360, 367, 397, 400; Apocryphal Acts, 404; tombs, 241; "Natale," 459; cultus of, 11. *See also* Churches
Apparitors, 229
Appeals, African practice, 20, 169 ff., 389; canons of "Nicæa" on, 170 ff., 175; case of Apiarius, 169 ff., 175 f., 178 f.; of Antony of Fussala, 177; practice of Gaul, 408-11; of Persia, 389, 391
Appeal of Chrysostom for support to Rome, Milan, and Aquileia, 71; Pope Innocent annuls sentence, 71, 460 f.; appeal of Flavian, Eusebius, and Theodoret to Rome, 292; action of Pope Leo, 292 f., 300, 309, 461
Appian Way, 135
Apringius, proconsul, executed (413), 99 f.
Apronianus, senator, converted by Melania, 134; friend of Rufinus, 45
Aps, Bishopric of, 417
Apt, 191. *See* Castor
Apulia, 21, 129
Aquæ Flaviæ, identification of, 405. *See also* Hydatius
Aquileia, Rufinus at, 37, 42 f., 134; invested by Alaric, 106; Placidia and, 187; captured by Attila, 413
Church of, as metropolis, 124, 181; province, 183 (*saec.* vi.), 129; Bp. consecrated by Bp. of Milan and *vice versa*, 463; rivals Milan, 20, 129; appealed to by Constantinople, 71, and by the Easterns, 129, 254; letter of Honorius to, 72; Pelagians in, 181, 183, 457
Bishops: Chromatius (*c.* 388-97), and Rufinus, 43, 45; Augustine (*c.* 407-

Aquileia—*continued*
34) and Pelagians, 181, 183; Nicetas (*c.* 458), letter of Pope Leo to, 21. *See also* Councils
Aquilinus, Bp. of Byblos (449-51), 291
Aquilinus, Rescript of Gratian to (A.D. 378), 466
Aquinas, St Thomas (1227-74), esteem for *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, 122
Aquitaine, 412; bishoprics of, 417; Goths in, 111, 402 f., 413, 415 ff.; birthplace of Sulpicius Severus and Paulinus of Nola, 116, and of Prosper, 194
Arabia, consecration of Bps. for it, by Bp. of Jerusalem, 251, 396; sympathy for Cyril, 261; in jurisdiction of Antioch, 319; province of, 334; Roman Arabia, 396; the Hedjaz, *ib.*; journey of Theophilus Blemmyas, 399; decline and revival of Christian settlements, 400. *See* Councils.
Arabia Felix, history of, 394, 396 f.
Arabissus, 73
Arabs: frontier tribes, 388, 394 ff.; invasion of Africa, 103; religious attitude (*saec.* vii.), 370; political centres, 394 ff.; migrations, 397
Aram, 362, 365
Aramæan, 380, 394
Aramazd, worship of, 369
Ararat, 362
Araxes, 362, 364
Arbela, 381, 386
Arbogast, 105
Arcadia, daughter of Arcadius, 201, 236
Arcadia, province of, 240
Arcadius, Bp., papal legate at Ephesus (431), 248, 253
Arcadius, Emp. (395-408): son of Theodosius I., 1; character, *ib.*; under guardians, 49 f.; marries Eudoxia, a Frank, 49 f.; relations with Goths, 50 f.; with Alaric, 105 f.; attitude of Gildo to, 85; attitude to Chrysostom, 62 f., 64 ff., 68 f., 70, 72; death, 107, 201
Arcadius, Spaniard (*saec.* v.), 436
Archangels, cult of, 10
Archdeacon, 53, 173, 196, 272, 305, 467
Archelaus, Bp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia (*c.* 430), condemns Messalians, 212
Archimagus, 380 f.
Archimandrite, office of, 280, 283, 286, 289; at Ælia, 327. *See* Barsumas, Eutyches, Gerontius
Archpriest, 329
Ardaches, King of Armenia (*saec.* v.), 376
Ardaschir, King of Persia (226-41), 394
Ardaschir, Beth, 273, 385
Ardaschir, Rew, 381
Ariadne, daughter of Emp. Leo, marries Zeno, 337, 342, 351
Arianism, early developments from, 266; little influence in Africa, 78 f., 121, or in Persia, 381; attitude of Donatus to, 78; silence of Prudentius, 114; influence in Dalmatia, 124, in Dacia, 127, in Cyrenaica, 203, among the Suevi, 406; its decline, 27, 53; assailed by Victorinus, 85; survival among Goths, 53, 120 f., 123, 194 f.; Nestorius' fear of, 229, 236, 238; repudiated by Cyril, 260; influence among Vandals, 431, 433, 437; propagation in *saec.* v., in Africa, 441 ff., in the West, 358, *cf.* 469
Arians, 358; at Milan, 121; Empress Justina, 120; treatment at Constantinople, 53, 58, 202, 211, 220 f., 229, 458; Theodosian legislation, 53; position at Antioch, 56, 68, 398, at Alexandria, 395, at Rome, 458; scarce in Africa, 121, *cf.* 431; writings, 121, 122; attitude to Aetius of Thessalonica, 126; Jerome's strictures, 155; African view of Council of Sardica, 172; Goths in Africa, 194 f.; Ricimer, 331, 448; Aspar, 331; Theophilus Blemmyas, 398; Ajax of Galatia, 406; the Vandals, 431, 433, 435 ff.; attitude to Deogratias of Carthage, 435; Cyrila, Bp. of Carthage, 437, 439 f., 442; policy of Genseric, 433-37, of Huneric, 437-44, 469; Odoacer and Theodoric, 467, 469; Jason and Bonosus, 122; Clementianus, 437
Ariminum. *See* Councils, Creeds
Aristaces, Bp. of Armenia, at Nicæa, 371
Aristolaus, tribune and notary, 259 f., 263, 265, 268
Aristotle, 183
Arius (256-331), 229, 358; his works prohibited, 43; views proscribed, 229, 308, 341; mode of death, 315. *See* Arianism, Arians
Arles: Code of, 86; Constantine III. installed, 107, 109; besieged there, 110; captured by Constantius, *ib.*, 160; headquarters against Goths, 111; designs of Goths on, 402; capital of Roman Gaul, 406 f.; rule of Aegidius and Syagrius, 415; Avitus acclaimed Emperor (455 A.D.), 447; danger from Visigoths, 416, 450; captured by Euric (A.D. 477), 422
Church of, alleged foundation by Trophimus (*saec.* i.), 161; jurisdiction of, 161, 407 ff., 410 f., 417, 422, 464 f.; Pontifical Vicariate, 407, 464 f. Bishops: Heros (*c.* 409-12), *q.v.*; Patroclus (412-426), *q.v.*; Honoratus (426-28), *q.v.*; Hilary (428-49), *q.v.*; Ravennius (449-55?), 411 f.; Leontius (*c.* 455-82), 421 f. *See* Councils

Armagh, Book of, 426
Armenia: Magna, 269, 363 f., 366 f.; Minor, 363 (*Prima* and *Secunda*), 365 f., 374; Roman, 215, 361, 365, 374, 390 f.; Persian, 268, 361, 365, 394; protectorate abandoned (363), 365, 374
Church of, 366, 396; foundation and history, 362-78; consecration of bishops 372-74; "Tome" of Proclus to, 269; St Basil and, 374 f.; monks of, 201, 215, 270, 277, 341, 373, 376, 390; persecution, 377, 389; clergy, 370, 373; priestly caste, 371; number of bishops, 377; reforms of Narses, 372 f.; not represented at Ephesus or Chalcedon, 390
Bishops: Gregory the Illuminator (*c.* 302), *q.v.*; Aristaces (*c.* 325), 371; Urthanes (*c.* 314), 371; Jousik (*c.* 330), 371; Pharen (*c.* 336), 372; Sahag, Isaac (*c.* 363), 372; Narses (*c.* 363 ?), *q.v.*; Cyril (?) (*c.* 373), 374 f.; Faustus (?) (*c.* 373), 374 f.; Zaven (*c.* 378), 375; Sahag (*c.* 380 ?), 375; Aschbourag (*c.* 382), 375; Sahag, Isaac the Great (390-441 ?), *q.v.*; Sourmag (*c.* 428), 376; Perkischo (*c.* 429), 376; Samuel (*c.* 432), 376; Joseph (†454), 377; Melidas (*c.* 454), 377; Moses (*c.* 457), 377; Kiud (*c.* 465), 377 f.; John Mantagouni (*c.* 480-87), 378, 391; Babken (*c.* 491), 391; John VI. (*saec.* x.), 391; Bp. Albian (*saec.* iii.), *q.v.*; Sahag, Bp. of Reschdouni (†454), 377. *See also* Merouzanes
Macedonianism in, 201; Messalians in, 213; Nestorianism in, 268 f., 391; Apollinarianism in, 269, 390; Monophysites in, 391; rejection of Chalcedon, 391. *See also* Councils
Armenian, alphabet, 376; language, v., 362, 374; writings, 270, 367, 370
Arminius, British deacon, at Arles (314), 424
Armorica, varying relations with the Empire, 109, 112, 402 f., 412, 415; history of Arles and, 412; wandering bands in, 414; Britons in, 414, 423
Army, Roman, of the East in Italy, 49 f.; importance in Africa, 78; in Britain, 107; in Egypt, 57; in Gaul, 403; in Thrace, 351; Barbarians in, 104 f., 361, 403, 448 ff.; British auxiliaries, 416, 420; Goths, 431 (*see also* Alaric, Gainas); massacre of. Germanic families by Roman soldiers, 108; Romans excluded from by Ostrogoths, 450; military intrigues, 107, 111, 351, 445, 450
Arnobius the Younger (*saec.* v.), 198, 234, 458
Arras, 402 f.
Arsaces, King of Armenia (*saec.* iv.), 372 f.
Arsacids, 364, 376
Arsacius, Bp. of Constantinople (404-5), 69 ff.
Artaxata, 364, 369
Arvernians, 415 f., 447
Ascanius, Bp. of Tarragona (*c.* 465), 21
Ascensio Isaiae, 122
Asceticism: in Africa, 141, 442; Armenia, 372 f.; Cappadocia, 372; at Constantinople, 202, 215, 277, 344 f.; in Egypt, 205 f., 216 ff., 344; Gaul, 115, 190 f., 408 f., 419; Ireland, 427; Palestine, 141, 216, 324 ff., 395; at Gaza, 326, 395; Persia, 380; Rome, 115, 141, 159; Syria, 213 f., 216, 220; Manichean, 454; conflict of ideals, 112 f., 115, 133 f., 151; Pelagianism and, 146 ff., 150, 188; unpopular with Roman clergy, 115, 159; writings of Evagrius, 29, 151; its attraction, 5, 115. *See* Monks, Solitaries, Stylites
Aschbourag, Bp. of Armenia (*c.* 382), 375
Aschdischad, Mother Church of Armenia, 369, 371 ff., 375
Ascoli, 297. *See* Lucentius
Asellus, priest, Roman legate in Africa, 170, 175
Asia, 162, 214, 292; "Diocese" of, 55, 219, 241 f., 319 ff., 334, 357; "Asiatics," 242; Proconsul of, 290; rich in bishoprics, 241; province of, 20
Asia Minor, 61, 275; bishoprics of, 67, 299, 320, 339; Christianity in, *saec.* iii., 370; Church organization (*q.v.*), 18, 20, 258, 299; Goths in, 50; Hittites in, 363; ravages of Isaurians in, 337; Messalians in, 212. *See also* Councils
Aspar, Patrician (*c.* 457), 331, 334; murdered (A.D. 471), 337
Aspebaetos, Bp. of Parembolæ (*c.* 431), 396
Assassination, 69, 94, 111, 121, 305, 351, 371
Assyria, 362, 379, 396
Astghig, 369
Astorga. *See* Turribius
Astronomy, 203
Asylum, 50 f., 107, 109 f., 135, 294; violation of, 91, 107, 210, 290, 332, 406
Aterbius, envoy of Epiphanius (A.D. 393), 30 f.
Athanakines, 372
Athanasius, St (*c.* 296-373) Bp. of Alexandria (328): 31, 57, 184, 239; attitude to Origen, 28; to canons of Sardica, 171; to Basil, 225; controversy with Eusebius of Nicomedia, 56; defended by Alexander of Thessalonica at Council of Tyre (335), 126; rehabilitated at Sardica (343), 424; defended and abandoned by Heremius of Thes-

salonica, 126; deposition, 399; attitude to Creed of Ariminum, 78; ordains Frumentius for Abyssinia, 398; relations with Church of Africa, 78, with Constantinople and Antioch, 239; his brothers, 58; his theology, 224 f., 231; *Letter to Epictetus*, 260; spurious writings, 231, 282; attitude of Cyril to him, 231, 282; of British Church, 424; Julian of Eclanum compared to him, 186
Athaulf, King of the Goths (*saec.* v.), 110 f., 121
Athenais Eudocia, Empress, 275 f., 325-28
Athenogenes, St (*c.* 196), relics of, 368
Athenians, 275, 328, 351
Athens, Roman legates at, 72; ravaged by Alaric, 105; Neoplatonism at, 351
Athyra, Castle of, 72
Atlas Mountains, 80
Attalus, usurping Emp. (*c.* 409), 94, 99; baptized, 121; deposed by Alaric (A.D. 410), 108; restoration, 111; opposed by Constantius, 160; literary pursuits, 111
Atticus, Bp. of Constantinople (406-25), succeeds Arsacius, 71; attitude to Chrysostom, 71, 208, 211, 219; character, 71, 201, 219; attitude to Pelagianism, 162, 185, 219; to Novatians, 202; to Messalians, 212; to Cyril, chap. ix. *passim*; quoted at Council of Ephesus, 245; baptizes Athenais Eudocia, 276, and Orestes, Augustal Prefect, 210; relation to Cyzicus, 220; death, 219
Atticus, Bp. of Nicopolis, attitude at Chalcedon (A.D. 451), 301, 303, 307
Attila, King of the Huns, invasion of Gaul (A.D. 451), 403, 413; invasion of Italy (A.D. 452), 286, 297, 413; Pope Leo and, 413, 467; death of (A.D. 453), 414
Auca, 406
Auch, 417
Audentius, Bp., 123
Auditores, 454, 456
Augustal Prefect in Egypt, 57; relations with Bp. of Alexandria, 40, 58, 209 f., 329. *See* Orestes, Pergamius, Theodore, Theognostus
Augustamnica, Province of, 240
Augustine, Bp. of Aquileia (*c.* 407-34), 181, 183
Augustine, St (354-430), 8, 99; fame as an orator, 85; early history, 85 ff., 143, 454 f.; effect on teaching, 143, 454 f.; knowledge of Manicheanism, 85, 186, 454-56; converted by Simplicianus of Milan, 128; influence of Victorinus on, 85 f.; ordained priest at Hippo (A.D. 391), 82, 85 f., 141; consecrated bishop (A.D. 395), 86; signature as bishop, 459; attitude to asceticism, 115, 142 f., 150; leniency of temper, 92, 115; fairness in controversy, 186; mysticism, 183; on "Cases of Conscience," 133; on frivolity of the times, 138 f.; conversions by him, 121; action as to Antony of Fussala, 176 ff.; attitude to Roman Church, 158, 166 f., 176 f., 179 f., 197; his influence, vi., vii., 166, 179, 274; death (A.D. 430), 195, 242, 251, 431; summoned to Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), 242, 251; *Life* by Possidius, 157, 181, 433, 455, 466
Relations with Ambrose, 86, *cf.* 88; Aurelius of Carthage, 87 f.; Jerome, 45, 151 f., 207; Leporius, 230; Marcellinus, 100, 146, 150; Bp. Memor, 182; Olympius, 94; Orosius, 137, 151, 153, 419; Paulinus of Nola, 164, 168, 183; Pinianus and Melania, 141 f., 168; Placidia, 175; Rufinus, 45
Controversy with Arians, 121 f.
Controversy with Donatists, 90 f.; Conference (A.D. 411), 96, 98, 150; relations with Emeritus, 101, 168; with Gaudentius, 102; on Donatism and Arianism, 78; on Tychonius, 79; on Rogatists, 80; on Donatists of Carthage, 83
Controversy with Pelagians, 143, 147 f., 150 f., 152 f., 157, 165 f., 168; view of Pelagius' Commentary on Pauline Epistles, 147; his writings quoted by Pelagius, 152
Controversy with Julian of Eclanum, 184-87
Doctrinal teaching: early influences, 143, 454 f.; on the Trinity, 121; on Free Will, 168, 192 f.; on Grace, 143, 145, 168, 192 f., 198; on Original Sin, 143 ff., 168; Perseverance, 193 ff.; Predestination, 194 f., 199, 422; attitude of Pope Zosimus, 162 f., 166 f., 176, 180; of Boniface, 177, 186; of Celestine, 177, 196 f., 230, 409; of Xystus, 168 f., 193, 198; doubtful views of it, 182, 184; attacked by Theodore of Mopsuestia, 185; defended by Prosper, 196 f., 284, 409, 421; Jerome and theology of, 155; Marius Mercator and, 231, 284; later development and modification, 145, 149; Augustine's use of Scripture, 98, 143, 149, 152, 187, 192
Works: style, 113; fairness, 186; collected, 100, 163; spurious, 188; lost works, 90, 101; *Confessions*, 85, 128, 147; *Retractations*, 46, 90, 101, 145; *Sermons*, 83, 101, 137, 150, 158; Letters, 90: (*Ep.* 44), 172; (*Epp.* 46-47), 133; (*Ep.* 73), 45; (*Epp.* 86,

Augustine, St—*continued*
88), 94; (*Ep.* 91), 169; (*Ep.* 93), 80 f., 93; (*Ep.* 94), 169; (*Ep.* 101), 182; (*Epp.* 125-26), 141; (*Ep.* 141), 101; (*Ep.* 146), 150; (*Ep.* 151), 100; (*Ep.* 156), 150; (*Ep.* 157), 150, 163; (*Epp.* 166-67), 151; (*Epp.* 170, 171), 121; (*Epp.* 175-76), 158; (*Ep.* 177), 157 f.; (*Epp.* 181-83), 158; (*Ep.* 185), 78, 93; (*Ep.* 186), 146; (*Ep.* 193), 231; (*Ep.* 194), 193; (*Ep.* 209), 177; (*Epp.* 214-16), 193; (*Ep.* 215), 166; (*Ep.* 217), 193; (*Ep.* 220), 431; (*Ep.* 228), 195; (*Epp.* 229-31), 194; (*Ep.* 242), 121 f. *City of God*, 137, 419; *De Cura pro Mortuis*, 9; *De Doctrina Christiana*, 79; *De Trinitate*, 121
(*a*) Against Arians, 121 f.; (*b*) Against Donatists, on Baptism, 90; *Breviculus Collationis*, 94, 100 f.; *Contra Cresconium*, 83, 90, 172; *Contra Gaudentium*, 102; *Contra Ep. Parmeniani*, 80, 90; *Contra Lit. Petiliani*, 81, 90; *De Gestis c. Emerito*, 101; *Post Collationem*, 91, 95, 101; (*c*) Against Pelagians, *De gratia Christi*, 145 f., 148, 163, 168; *De Natura et Gratia*, 46, 152; *De Peccatorum Meritis*, 145, 150; *De Peccato Originali*, 163, 168; *De Gestis Pelagii*, 148, 151, 153 f., 158; others, 150, 152, 165, 193 ff.; (*d*) Against Julian of Eclanum, 183, 186; *Opus Imperfectum*, 166, 185 f.; (*e*) Anti-Manichean works, 454-56
Augustinianism, Chap. viii. *passim*, 421; the Church and, 145, 149.
Augustus, Emp. (29 B.C.-A.D. 14), 396
Aurasius, Mt., 82, 102
Aurelian, Emp. (270-75), 106
Aurelian, consul (*c.* 399), 51; saved by Chrysostom, 54
Aurelius, Bp. of Carthage (391-430): appointment, 82; organizes Church of Africa, 85 ff., 179 f., 181; character, 87; relations with Augustine, 87 f., 195 *al.*; with Pope Anastasius, 89; with Pinianus and Melania, 141; with Paulinus, 148, and Celestius, *ib.*; with Jerome, 156; with Pope Innocent, *ib.*; with Zosimus, 156 f., 164 ff., 171; with Xystus, 169; with Faustinus, the legate, 170 f., 178 f.; with Pope Boniface, 176; with Leporius, 230; with Placidia, 175, and Ravenna, 181; conference with Donatists (A.D. 411), 96; death, 195
Aurelius, Marcus, Emp. (161-80), 364
Ausonius, consul (379): Christianity of, 113, 114, 204; literary pursuits, 114 f.; relations with Paulinus, *ib.*
Ausurians, 205
Auvergne: Venerandus, Bp. († *c.* 423), 117; Persian fugitive in, 388; Sidonius Apollinaris, *q.v.*; Count Victorius, Governor of, 418. *See* Arvernians, Avitus (Emp.)
Auxentius, St, solitary (*c.* 451), 328
Auxentius, Bp. of Dorostorum (*saec.* iv.), Arian, 120; writings, 122
Auxentius, Bp. of Milan (*c.* 364), 128, 440
Auxerre. *See* Germanus
Auxiliaries. *See* Army
Auxiliaris, Prefect of the Gauls (*saec.* v.), 411
Avars, 125
Avellana, Collectio, 130, 163 ff., 172, 174 f., 185, 466
Avellino, diocese of, 182
Aventine, 131, 452
Avienus, senator (*saec.* v.), 413
Avignon, 417; Nectarius, Bp. (439-51), 411
Avita, niece of Melania, 134
Avitus, Bp. of Vienne (*c.* 494-518), writings, 123, 421
Avitus, Emp. (455-56), 415 f.; accession, deposition, and consecration as Bp., 447
Axoum, 397-99
Azad, eunuch, 383

Babken, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 491), 391
Babowai, Catholicos of Persia (457-84), 389 f., 392
Babylon, 380, 385, 394, *cf.* 104
Bacour, King of Iberia (*saec.* iv.), 325, 361
Bactriana, 379
Bætica, 402
Bagai, Donatist centre, 82, 102; their outrages at, 91 ff., 94. *See* Councils
Bagavan, Church of, 369
Bagaudæ, 402 f.
Bagdad, 385
Bagradas, 434
Bagrevan, 369
Bahram V., King of Persia (420-38), 376, 388 f.
Baking: and Donatism, 81
Baksheesh, 58, 61, 252, 260 f.
Balai, Persian *Chorepiscopus* (*c.* 436), 264, 392
Balasch, King of Persia (484-8), 378
Balasch, supporter of Ibas of Edessa, 392
Balearic Islands, 432, 439
Balkans, 125
Bannaventa Berniæ, identification of, 426
Baptism, of adults, 4, 16, 86, 114, 121, 149, 210, 275 f.; of children, 7, 16, 144, 149, 157, 163, 165; deferred, 4 f., 6 f., 131, 451; forced, 441; rebaptism, 77, 81, 88 f., 441

Baptism—*continued*
Conditions of admission, 20, 33; preparation for, 4, 16, 127; catechetical instruction, 4, 33, 68, 127; obligations of, 112 f.; laxity in, 3 f.
Pelagian view of, 144, 149, 163, 165; Manichean, 456; its validity, *ibid.*; validity of schismatic, 89; nullity of baptism, 77, 210, 441; rebaptism controversies, 77, 81, 88 f., 441
Mode of, 16, 68, 443; benediction of fonts, 7; function of exorcists in, 16; white robe, 442 f.; formal record of, 441; Godfathers, 276, 442; St Patrick's refusal of fees for, 427. *See* Baptistery
Seasons of, 3, 131; Holy Saturday, 7 f., 68, 174; eve of Pentecost, 7 f.; Christmas, 8; Epiphany, 8
Baptist, St John. *See* John
Baptistery, 3 f., 5; of the Lateran, 292, 452 f.; of Quirinus at Alexandria, 332; Baths of Constantine as, 68
Baradatus, solitary (*saec.* v.), 266; a Syrian (Varadatus), 335
Barbarians: course of invasion in Africa, 133, 138, 194 f., 204, 358, 430-44, 447; hair of, 438; in Armenia, 371; in Asia, 337, 388, 447; in Egypt, 310; in Ireland, 425; in Europe, Chap. v., 202, 334, 347, 358, Chaps. xiv., xv.
Influence on army, 104 f., 448 f., 450; on Church organization, 22, 347, 403 f., 406, 417, 435, 437 ff.; on civil organization, 104, 334, 423 f., 449 f., 468
Arian influences on, 120 f., 406, 433, 437 ff., 442 f.; Catholic, 53, 404, 406, 418
Reflexions, 104, 138 f., 371, 418 f., 449; Claudian on Gildo, 85; dislike of, in Rome and Italy, 107 f., 447.
Barbarism, 145, 423, 430, 447, 459
Barbaschemin, Bp. of Seleucia (342-46), 383
Barcelona, 111, 114, 141, 466
Bardesanes, Syrian writer (*c.* 155-223), work of his school, 379
Barhebræus, Arabian historian (1226-86), 224
Bari, 299
Barlaam, St, Martyr under Diocletian, Church of, 343
Barnabas, St, 250
Barsabæus. *See* Simon
Barsumas, Syrian archimandrite, Cyrillian, vi.; Eutychian, 277, 285, 287, 292; at Ephesus (A.D. 449), 285, 287, 292, 392; at Chalcedon (A.D. 451), 305; his violence, vi, 25, 293, 305
Barsumas, metropolitan of Nisibis (*saec.* v.), 392 f.
Bartholomew, St, and Armenia, 367; and India, 397
Basil, Bp. of Antioch (*c.* 456), 335, 341 f.
Basil, St, Bp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia (370-379), and Origen, 28 f.; and Evagrius, 28 f.; homilies of., 46; theology, 224 f.; relation to Athanasius, 225; charities, 372; story of the dove, 372; protest against assassination of Narses, 373; relations with Armenia, 374 f.
Basil, Bp. of Larissa (*c.* 431), 249 f.
Basil, Bp. of Seleucia in Isauria (*c.* 448-58), 300 f.
Basil, priest, papal legate at Chalcedon, 297
Basil, deacon of Constantinople (*c.* 435), 269
Basil, the Cilician, historian (*c.* 500), viii., 358
Basilicas, 14, 218; at Carthage, 82, 433, 435; at Chalcedon, 298 f.; at Ephesus, 242 f., 244 ff., 247, 287, 290. At Rome, 451 f.; Julian, 137, 451; Lateran, 132, 137, 173 f., 407, 452 f.; Liberian, 451 f., 466, Theodora, 173; Vatican, 5 f., 173, 458; outside the walls (St Peter, 109, 452, St Paul, 452, 468); mortuary basilica of the Probi, 5, 131; Crescentiana, 452. At Constantinople, 60, 65, 270
Basilicus, St, Bp. of Comana, martyr (312), 73, *cf.* 271
Basilicus, 337
Basiliscus, Emp. (*c.* 475-76), 337, 344; unskilful general, 432; doctrinal sympathies, 338 f., 343, 469; Encyclical, 338 f., 344 f., 353; Anti-encyclical, 344 f.; death, 345
Basiliscus, subdeacon, papal messenger (417), 164
Basket-making, 339
Bassa, Abbess, 327
Bassa, St, monastery of, 342
Bassora, 381, 386
Bassus, Junius, Prefect of Rome (359), 5
Bastinado, 442
Batanea, 10
Batavia, 402
Bathanarius, Count of Africa (401-8), 89, 94
Baths, 68, 95 f., 240, 329
Bauto, Consul (*saec.* iv.), 49, 105
Bayeux, 414
Bazas, 417
Beatus, Spanish priest (*saec.* viii.), 79
Bede, Venerable (673-735), 79, 427
Bedouins, 217
Beit-Lapat, 386, 392. *See* Councils
Beit-Selok, 386, 389. *See* John
Belgæ, 230
Belgica, 107
"Benedictions," 261
Beneventum, 182. *See* Æmilius

Berbers, 78
Bergamo, 129, 413
Bernia, 426
Berœa, 394. *See* Acacius, Aleppo
Beronician, Bp. of Perga (*c.* 426-31), 212
Bertrand, St, de Comminges, 119
Berytus. *See* Eustathius
Besançon, 409 f. *See* Chelidonius
Bessula, deacon of Carthage at Ephesus (431), 243
Beth-Ardaschir, 273, 385
Beth-Arsam, 392. *See* Simeon
Bethlehem, Cassian at, 191; Epiphanius at, 32; Jerome at, 32-35, 45-47, 118 f., 141, 150 f., 154 f., 191, 206 f.; Marcian the monk at, 353; Postumianus at, 118; Vigilantius at, 119; Grotto of the Nativity, 11, 33
Beth-Rufin, 317
Bible, 362; liturgical use, 8; African collections of texts, 97; Augustine's exegesis, 98, 143, 149, 152, 187, 192; his view of, LXX., 152; Chrysostom's exegesis, 60 f., 65; Cyprian's collections, 146; Cyril's knowledge, 44, 231 f.; Jerome's exegesis, 29, 132, 136, 152, 155; Macarius', 62; Origen's, 28 f., 60, 152; Pelagius', 146 f.; Persian, 380; Priscillian's collections, 146; Tychonius and, 79; dangers of exegesis under Vandals, 434, 441; John of Jerusalem on anthropomorphism, 32; use of Bible by Gildas, 430; references to Ararat, 362; Roman See and, 459; Apollinarian interpretations, 231 f.; asceticism and, 112; Predestination and, 193; uncanonical books, 10; Talmud, 380
Bishoprics: nominations to, 130; numerous in Africa and Asia, 241; few in Thrace, 320; new foundations in Armenia, 373, and Spain, 406, 423; immediate jurisdiction of Rome, 130, 462; of Alexandria, 462
Bishops, one in one place, 86, 380, 385; two, 86, 97, 380; position (*saec.* v.), 14 f.; election of, 15, 17 f., 52, 173, 204, 329, 332, 407 f.; confirmation of, 17, 130, 204; consecration of, 18, 177, 250, 429, etc.; organization, 18 f., 116, 204, 241 f., 406-12, 460, 464. (*See also* Church organization, Councils); in Africa, 171, 440; in Arabia and Syria, 396; in Persia, 380, 389
Attitude to monks, 23-26, 35, 155, 240; monks as bishops, 190, 403, 407, 419; effect of dissensions, 112, 208, 394; married men as, 188, 204, 275, 410; robes of, 31, 177, 409
As civil arbitrators, 14; importance in civil life, 14, 17, 417; "luxury," 52, 155; intervention with barbarians, 403, 417, 446; former officials chosen as, 213, 328, 403 f., 410, 416, 418 f.; ex-soldiers, 117; consecration of deposed emperors, 447, 449; of an *apocrisiarius*, 294; of a deacon, 346, 425
Number of: 600-1000 at Ariminum (359), 440; 38 or 36 at Synod of The Oak (403), 62, 72; 270 at Donatist Council of Carthage (*c.* 330?), 77; 100 at Donatist Council of Cabarsussi (393), 83; 310 at Donatist Council of Bagai (394), 83; 470 Catholic sees in Africa, 98; 266 Catholic bishops, 279 Donatist at Conference (411), 97 f.; 214 at Council of Carthage (418), 165; nearly 300 in "Diocese" of Asia, 241; imperial limitation for Council of Ephesus (431), 240; *c.* 200 at Cyril's Council, 244; 43 Easterns, 247; 16 from Palestine at Ephesus (431, 449), 240, 287; *c.* 130 at Latrocinium (449), 287; *c.* 520 for Chalcedon (451), 297; 500-700 Greek bishops sign Encyclical of Basiliscus, 345; 77 bishops in Roman Synod (484), 355; *c.* 30 bishops, from Provence, Vienne, and Lyons in Council of Arles (473-74), 421; 466 Catholic bishops from Vandal kingdom, at Carthage (484), 439, *cf.* 441; *c.* 100 bishops in patriarchate of Alexandria, 462; *c.* 200 in immediate jurisdiction of Pope, 462; 25-30 in "Diocese" of Thrace, 320; 17 Armenian, 377
Biskra, 168. *See* Optatus
Bithynia, 320, 334
Black Sea, 73, 214, 336, 360, [362]
Blæsilla, 132
Blemmyas. *See* Theophilus
Blemmyes, 72, 400
Bobbio Manuscripts, 122
Body, Resurrection of the, views of Origen, 28; of Synesius, 204
Boniface, Count of Africa (*c.* 429), 194 f., 401, 431
Boniface, Pope (419-22): conflict with Eulalius, 173 ff., 451; relations with Augustine, 177, 186; with Thessalonica, 250; with Gallican clergy, 408 f.; Prosper and, 197; death, 178
Boniface, priest of Rome, legate of Pope Leo at Chalcedon, 297
Bonosiaci, 123
Bonosus, Bp. of Naissus (*c.* 391): his doctrines and schism, 123 f.; question of his ordinations, 124, 127
Bonosus, Arian "Doctor," 122
Books, 41 f., 210, 267 f., 429, 440, 454, 456

Bordeaux, 417 ; home of Ausonius, 113 f. ; of Paulinus of Nola, 114 ; Goths at, 110. *See* Amandus, Delphinus
Bosmari, King, 325
Bosphorus, 62, 69, 107, 216, 254, 307, 345 ; topography of, 214 f., 320, 360 f. ; jurisdiction of Constantinople beyond, 220, 320, *cf.* 241 ; illuminations, 65, 271
Bossuet (1627-1704), 145
Bostra, 395 ; see of, 67, 261 ; jurisdiction claimed by Jerusalem, 251
Boulogne, 403
Bourges, Goths at, 414 ff., 420
Brabant, 402
Brahmins, 397
Brescello, 129
Brescia, 128 ; Bp. at Sardica, 129 ; Huns at, 413. *See also* Gaudentius, Philastrius
Breviarium of Alaric, 411 ; of Liberatus, *q.v.* ; Hipponense, 87
Breviatio canonum, 86
Britain, Roman, 189, 425 ; its provinces, 423 f. ; revolts in (*saecc.* iv.-v.), 107, 423 ; separation from Empire, 109, 112, 188, 401, 403 ; position at end of *saec.* v., 469 ; Anglo-Saxon, 189, 423, 428, 430 ; paganism in, 358 ; Gildas and barbarism in, 430
Pelagius in, 145 ff. ; his supporters, 188, 425 ; Germanus and Lupus in, 188 f., 413, 425 ; Pope Celestine and, 197, 425 ; Victricius in, 117, 425 ; birthplace of St Patrick, 426. *See* Britons
British Church, 424 f. ; martyrs, 424 ; share in Councils, 424 ; relations with Palladius, 429
Britius, Brice, St, Bp. of Tours (*c.* 396-443), 116 f.
Britonia, 423
Britons, British, 469 ; "Historia Britonum," 189 ; Pelagius, 131, 145, 147, 157, 193 ; Faustus of Riez, 420 ; St Patrick, 426, 428
Affection for Germanus, 189, 413 ; auxiliaries in Gaul, 416, 420 ; missionaries in Ireland, 189 (*see also* St Patrick) ; settlements in Armorica, 414, 423, in Spain, 423
Briviesca, 406
Bruttium, 21, 136
Bubalius, the Cretan (*saec.* v.), 127
Burgos, 406
Burgundians on Rhine frontier, 105, 112, 402 ; support Jovinus, 110 ; oppose Aegidius, 415 ; in provinces of Vienne and Lyons, 421 f., 450 ; military ambitions, 448 f. *See* Gondebaud
Burial : of the dead, officials for, 16 ; near to saints, 9 ; Vandal interference with, 434 ; of Patriarchs of Alexandria, 340, 350 ; of Constantinople, 211, 271, 296.
Burning, 138 : of Manicheans, 437, 456 ; of Arians, 438 ; of Catholics, 439 ; of books, 41, 267, 456 ; of churches, 94, 221 ; of St Sophia, 69, 72 ; of Cæsarea in Mauritania, 80
Byblos, 291. *See* Aquilinus
Byzacena, 83, 87 f., 121, 443 ; Zosimus and, 169 ; in power of Genseric, 432, 434. *See* Councils, Crescens, Facundus, Musonius, Victor of Vita
Byzantine Church, 347, 396 ; code of canons, 87, 387 ; Court, 24, 318, 461 ; Episcopate, 356, 388, 390 f. ; officials, 360 ; theology, 350 ; catalogues, 367
Byzantium, 367, 374 f. *See* Faustus

CABARSUSSI, 83, 85
Cæcilian, Bp. of Carthage (311-45 ?), 84, 98 ; at Nicæa, 172
Cæcilian, official in Africa (*saec.* v.), 94
Cæcilian, Prætorian Prefect (*saec.* v.), 100
Caelian Hill. *See* Rome.
Caer-Leon, 424
Cæsar, Julius, 104, 396, 416
Cæsarea in Cappadocia, 67, 69 ; metropolis, 212, 320, 373, 375 ; residence of Vicarius of Pontus, 320 ; rivalled by Ancyra, 320 ; place of consecration for Armenian Catholicos, 373 ; consecration of Gregory the Illuminator there (*c.* 302), 368, 373
Bishops : Eusebius (360-70), 372 ; Basil, St (370-79), *q.v.* ; Archelaus (*c.* 430), 212 ; Firmus (*c.* 431-39), *q.v.* ; Thalassius (*c.* 439-51), *q.v.* ; Alypius (*c.* 458), 212
Cæsarea in Mauritania, burnt (A.D. 372), 80 ; Augustine at, 101, 168. *See* Emeritus
Cæsarea in Palestine, 67 ; metropolis, 154, 251, 318 f. ; relations with Jerusalem, 251, 318 f. *See* Eulogius, Eusebius
Cæsarea in Thessaly. *See* Theoctistus
Cæsareum. *See* Alexandria
Cæsariensis, Flavia, British province, 423
Cæsariensis, Maxima, British province, 423
Cahors, 117. *See* Alithius
Calabria, 21
Calahorra, 406. *See* Silvanus
Calama. *See* Possidius
Caledonia, 423
Calendion, Bp. of Antioch (481-85) : consecrated at Constantinople, 343 ; his difficulties, 351 f. ; exiled, 352
Caliphs, 394
Callinicus, biographer of Hypatius, 215
Calpurnius, deacon, father of St Patrick, 426
Cambrai, Franks at, 402 ; bishopric, 403

Campania, 435; Alaric in, 109; Paulinus of Nola and, 114 f., 135; represented at Sardica, 129
Canal, 385
Candidian "Comes Domesticorum": represents Theodosius at Ephesus, (A.D. 431), 242; his difficulties, 244 ff., 247 f.
Candles, 14, 99, 119, 301
Cannes, 190
Cannibalism: among Scots, 145; at Alexandria, 210
Canon Law, African, 169 ff.; Irish, 189; Byzantine, 87, 387
Canons, African, 19, 79, 82, 86 f., 165 f., 169, 171, 176, 466; Ancyra, 19, 387; Antioch, 67 f., 305, 387; of "Arles," 86, 123; Armenian, 373; Asiatic, 19; of Chalcedon (Can. 9, 17), 320 (Can. 28), 321, 333, 339; of Constantinople, 19, 55, 319, 321; of Elvira, 12, 34; of Ephesus, 221; Gallican, 414; of Gangra, 19, 387; of Laodicea, 19, 387; of Neo-cæsarea, 19, 387; of Nicæa, 19, 72, 86, 171 f., 175, 179, 323, 386 (Can. 6), 321 (Can. 6, 7), 318, (Can. 8), 86; Roman, 82, 130; of Sardica, 19, 171 f., 175, 179, 323; of Telepte, 87; of Toledo, 5, 113
Relating to discipline, 67 f., 204, 305, 320; to jurisdiction, 258, 320 f.
Collections: their basis and growth, 19; Byzantine, 87, 387; *Libri canonum* of Carthage, 86; *Breviarium Hipponense*, 87; *Codex canonum*, *q.v.*; *Libri canonum* of Gaul and Italy, 21; Cologne MS. of Councils, 408; collection of Thalassius of Angers, 414; "Code of Arles," 86; "Second Council of Arles," 123; *Collectio Hibernica*, 189; *Hispana*, 86; *Liber Regularum* of Pope Innocent, 118, 130; Roman collections, 171; Papal Decretals, *see* Decretals; *Breviatio* of Fulgentius Ferrandus, 86; Dionysius Exiguus, 87; collection of the Deacon Theodosius, 171
Canopus, 339, 346 f.
Capital sentences, 160, 410
Cappadocia: plateau of, 362; relations with Armenia, 363, 365, 370, 373, 375; Huns in, 34, 50; Messalians in, 212; theologians of, 224, 231; monastic opposition to Chalcedon, 328; exile of Emp. Basiliscus to, 345; education of Gregory the Illuminator there, 367, and of Narses, 372; ecclesiastical jurisdiction in, 374; Magi in, 388. *See* Cæsarea, Tyana
Caprasius, friend of Honoratus (*saec.* v.), 190
Capreolus, Bp. of Carthage (*c.* 431), 243, 433; his view of Nestorianism, 312
Captivity, the, 380
Capua. *See* Councils
Caravan, 217, 243, 246, 310
Caria, 72; Quartodecimans in, 221; paganism in, 351; province of, 334
Carolingian renaissance, 430
Carosus, monk of Constantinople, 25; at Chalcedon (A.D. 451), 305; refuses to recognize Council, 328
Carpi, 77
Cartenna, Rogatists at, 80. *See* Rogatus, Vincent
Carthage, 85; Curia of, [91], 433; municipal registers, 91; port, 121, 140; Count Heraclian at, 99, 140; his execution (A.D. 413), 99; Sigisvult and the Goths at (A.D. 427), 121; Vandals at, 195; capture (A.D. 439), 432 f., 455; subjection, 358; failure of Basiliscus at (A.D. 468), 432; Vandal base against Italy, 447
The Anicii Probi at, 140; Apiarius, 170; Augustine (*q.v.*), 147, 454; Celestius, 148; Julian of Eclanum, 182; Liberatus the deacon, 317; Manicheans, 454, 456; Paulinus the deacon, 148, 163 f.; Pelagius, 147; Pelagians, numerous, 150, 157; Pinianus and Melania, 141; Vitalis, 193
Church of C.: mother church of Africa, 18 f.; position of its bp., 464; number of clergy, 442; schism (of A.D. 313), 84; conference with Donatists (A.D. 411), 95-9, 439; its "Acts," 100; conference with Arians (A.D. 484), 439 f., 442, 444; relations with Alexandria, 171, 175; with Constantinople, 162; with Rome, 82, (Zosimus) 164 f., 170 f., (Xystus) 169, (Leo) 435
Persecution under Genseric, 433, 435; attitude of Huneric, 437; his persecution, 442; long vacancy of See, 437; closing and re-opening of churches, 443; 500 Catholic clergy, 442
Bishops: Cyprian, St (248-57), *q.v.*; Cæcilian (311-45 ?), *q.v.*; Gratus (343-53), 78 f., 87, 172; Restitutus (*c.* 359), 78; Genethlius (374-91), *q.v.*; Aurelius (391-430), *q.v.*; Capreolus (*c.* 431-5 ?), *q.v.*; Quodvultdeus (*c.* 438-44?), 433, 435; Deogratias (*c.* 454-7), 435; long vacancy, 437; Eugenius (481-505?), *q.v.* *See also* Councils, Majorinus
Donatist bps.: Donatus the Great (315-50), *q.v.*; Parmenian (*c.* 350-91), *q.v.*; Primianus (*c.* 391), *q.v.*; schism, 83 f.; Maximian (*c.* 393), 83 f., 89
Arian bp.: Cyrila (*c.* 481), *q.v.*; Jucundus (*c.* 483), 438

Carthage—*continued*
Buildings: Basilica "Perpetua Restituta," 82, 433; of Faustus, 435; churches of St Agileus, 443, of St Cyprian and St Perpetua, 433; Baths of Gargilius, 95 f.
Carthaginensis, Spanish province, 405
Carus, Marcus Aurelius, Emp. (281-2), 364
Casae Nigrae, 77. *See* Donatus
Cascante, Cascantum, 406
Casinensis, Bibliotheca, 246, 261, 270
Caspian Sea, 361 f.
Cassian, John (*c.* 355-445?); not a "Scythian," 190 f.; his travels and friends, *ibid.*; at Marseilles, 190 f., 196, 230, 420; character, 191; influence, 230, 235, 284; on Free Will and Grace, 193, 266, 422; relations with Leo, 196, 230; *Collationes*, 32, 38, 191, 193, 197, 419; attacked by Prosper, 197 f.; *De Incarnatione*, 196, 228, 230; and *De Institutis Cœnobiorum*, 191, 419; "Consultatio," 230, 235
Cassino, Monte, 261, 270. *See* Casinensis
Cassiodorus (*c.* 466-560?); on the Apocalypse, 79; *De Institutione Divinarum Litterarum*, 334
Castel dell' Uovo, 449
Castinus, "Magister Militum" (*c.* 423), 187
Castor, Bp. of Apt (*c.* 420), 191
Castricia, 54
Catacombs, 453
Catalogues, Byzantine, 367
Catastases, 146
Catastasis, 205. *See* Synesius
Catechists, 370
Catechumens, 33, 68, 127, 456
Catholicos: of Armenia, 367 f.; position, 371, 381; residence, 368, 375; family, 371 f.; consecration, 372 f. *See* Armenia
of Persia, 388; position, 381, 389; see 381, 384 f., 393. *See* Persia
Catholics, 47; among barbarians, 404, 406, 418; in Britain, 425; as opposed to Arians at Constantinople, 58, in Africa, 433 f., 435-43; in Rome, 458 f.; to Donatists in Africa, 77 ff., 84 f., 87, 90 f., 93, 95, 131, 459; apology of Optatus, 79; Tychonius and, 80; persecution by Firmus, 80 f.; as opposed to Novatians, 453 f.; "catholicus sacerdos," 293, *cf.* 459
Catiline, 156
Caucasia, 326, 364
Caucasus, 360 f., 363; gates of the, 388; Pityus, 73, 343, 360; crossed by Huns, 50
Celeda, identification of, 206
Celestiacus, 433
Celestians, 200. *See* Celestius
Celestine, Pope (422-32); succeeds Boniface, 177 f.; his "simplicity," 235; contrasted with Xystus III., 265; decretal letters, 21, 196 f., 199, 409; sends delegates to Ephesus (A.D. 431), 170, 242 f., 248, 452; attitude to Pelagianism, 187 f., 197, 234, 425; to Novatians, 453; influence of Leo with, 230, 467; relations with Antioch, 259, 267, with Britain, 188, 197, 425, 429, with Thessalonica, 250, with the Government, 251; renovates Julian basilica, 137, *cf.* 452; death, 197
and Apiarius, 178; Augustine, 177, 196 f., 230, 409; Cassian, 230 f.; and Celestius, 187; Cyril of Alexandria, 234-7, 243, 245, 256 f.; Gallic bishops, 21, 196 f., 199, 409; Marius Mercator, 231; Nestorius, 229 f., 234, 245, 248; Palladius, 188, 425, 429; Prosper, 409
Celestius (*fl.* 405-31): advocate, 147; eunuch, 147; disciple of Pelagius, 142, 147 f., 154; errors, 148; clumsiness of expression, 184; alleged repudiation by Pelagius at Diospolis (A.D. 415), 154; knowledge of Greek, 149; on baptism of children, 149, 163; influence in Britain, 189; in East, 150; profession of faith, 162 f.; attack on Philip of Side, 233
Goes to Africa, 142, 148; charged with heresy by Paulinus, 148, 163 f.; excommunicated at Carthage (A.D. 411), 149, 153; official record, 148, 157, 249; appeals to Rome, 149; priest at Ephesus, 149 f., 162; visits to Rome, 148, 162, 167 f., 170, 181, 187; expulsion ordered, 167; at Constantinople, 162, 229; Imperial rescripts, 167, 187; condemned by Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), 249
Atticus of Constantinople and, 162; Aurelius of Carthage and, 148, 164 f.; Pope Celestine and, 187; Cyril of Alexandria and, 185; Heros and Lazarus, 154, 163; Pope Innocent, 157, 162, 185, 199; Julian of Eclanum, 183 f.; Leo, 199; Nestorius, 229, 231; Pope Zosimus, 162 f., 164 f., 167 f., 183, 199
Contra traducem peccati, 148
Celibacy: of Celestius, 147; of clergy, Pope Siricius and (A.D. 386), 82; in Southern Gaul, 120; of "Confessors" at Rome, 26; of Manicheans, 454; Nicetas and a married Virgin, 127
Celts, barbarism of, 423; speech, 424, 428
Cemetery, Cœmeterium, 16, 443, 453
Ceneda, 206
Censuum, Liber, 465

Ceponius, Galician Bp. (*c.* 447), 404 f.
Ceremonial, 14, 16. *See* Baptism
Cevennes, 422
Ceylon, 399
Chair, Episcopal, 52, 65, 344, 437; of St Peter, 293
Chalcedon: Goths at (399), 51; Arcadius at, 51; Theophilus of Alexandria at (403), 61 f.; Cyril at (431), 253 f., 257, 259; Emp. Zeno at (475), 337; proposed Olympic Games, 216; Theodosius II., summons Conference at (431), 253 f., 257
Bishops: Cyrinus (*c.* 401-5), 62, 69, 206; Eulalius (*c.* 430), 214 f., 254
Buildings: Basilica of St Euphemia, 51, 66, 299 f., 306 f.; Villa of the Oak, 62 f., 215; Church of St Peter and St Paul, 62, 66; St Mocius, 66; Monastery of Rufinianæ, 214 f., 254; of St Bassa, 342
Council (A.D. 451), Chap. xi. *passim*. Authorities, 241, 298, 301 f., 306, 308, 316 f.; bishops at, 297-99, 307, 375, 390, 396; Pope Leo and, 297 f., 322 f., 330, 334 f.; Roman legates, 297 ff., 303 f., 309, 320 f., 412, 461; Emp. Marcian at, 307 f. (Session 1), 291, 298, 300, 302 f., 304, 323, 329: documents of Latrocinium read, 290 f., 300 f.; the legates and Dioscorus, 299 f.; proposed depositions, 301; the Trisagion, 301. (Session 2), 233, 301 ff.: Creeds of Nicæa and Constantinople, 302; Tome of Leo, 302 f.; attitude to Cyril, 302 f. (Session 3), 272, 296, 303 f.: case of Dioscorus, 296, 300-4, deposition, 303 f.; signatures and notification, 304 f. (Session 4), 304-6: acceptance of Tome of Leo, 304 f., 461; treatment of the Egyptians, 304 ff. (Session 5), 306 f.: the Definition, *ibid.* (Session 6), 307 f.: Promulgation of the Definition, 307 f. (Session 7 ?), 308 ff.: case of Domnus of Antioch, 308 f.; restoration of Ibas and Theodoret, 309. (Session 8): case of Amphilochius of Side, 335. (Acts i., v.), 289; (Act viii.), 309; (Acts ix., x.), 309; (Act x.), 273, 309
Questions of jurisdiction, 318-21; canons, 320 f., 333, 339; unpopular at Ephesus, 339
The Council and Flavian, 293, 303, 322; condemnation of Eutyches, 305, 308, 316, 322, 324; and of Nestorius, 309, 316, 324
Theology, 245; the Definition, 302, 304, 306 ff., 309 f., 316 f., 330, 349; Diphysite, 224; Monophysite views of, 305, 309 f., 316, 346, 349; in relation to Henotikon, 349; Nestorius' view of, 310 ff.; various use of term "Nestorian," 306 ff., 309 f., 313, 331, 342; Cyrillian resistance, 318; supported by Acœmeti, 342, 355; attitude of ascetics, 218, 328; of St Auxentius, 328; of monks, 216, 305 f., 324-26, 328 f., 335, 340 f., 350 f.; long controversies, vii., 461; opposition in Egypt, 330, 457, 468; hesitation in Pamphylia, 334 f.; condemnation in Armenia (A.D. 491), 391; rejection in Persia, 393; acceptance by Nonnus of Edessa, 392
Attitude of Aspar, 331; of Athenais Eudocia, 325 f.; and Emp. Leo, 331, 334 f., 468; and Emp. Zeno, 338, 348 f.; and Emp. Basiliscus, 338; its effect, 345
Attitude of Acacius of Constantinople, 347 f., 355, 357; of Martyrius of Jerusalem, 353; of Peter the Fuller, 342, 352; of Peter Mongus, 350 f.; of Timothy Aelurus, 335, 338 ff.
Chalcis, 353, 394
Chaldæa, Chaldees, 362, 381, 384
Champagne, 403
Chancery, ecclesiastical, 17, 244, 290. *See* Apocrisiarii
Imperial, 95, *cf.* 96
Channel, English, 107
Chapters, Three, 241, 268, 270, 317
Chapters, Twelve, 314
Charisius, Steward of Church of Philadelphia (*saec.* v.), 250
Charity, 136; organization of, 6, 18, 372; at Alexandria, 39; at Constantinople, 52; of Fabiola, 132; of Pinianus and Melania, 134, 141; of Deogratias, 435
Chartres, 118. *See* Valentinus
Chaves, 405
Chelidonius, Bp. of Besançon (*c.* 445), deposed by Hilary of Arles, 409 f.; restored by Pope Leo, 410
Chereas, governor of Osrhoene (*c.* 449), 285, 392
Cherson, 336, 338 f.
Chersonese, Tauric, 360
Children: in Manichean rites, 455. *See also* Baptism
Chonæ, 10
Chorene, 367. *See* Moses
Chorepiscopi, 264
Choristers, 442
Chott-el-Fedjadj, 441
Chrism, 77
Christening robe, 442 f., *cf.* 5
Christianity: and the Empire, 2-5, 259, 389, 430; expansion, 357 f., Chap. xiii.; among Arabs and Indians, 394-400; in Armenia, 362-78; in Britain, 424 f., 430; in the Caucasus,

Christianity—*continued*
360 f.; in Gaul, 403 f., 407-19; in Iberia, 325, 361; in Ireland, 425-29; in Persia, 378-90
and Judaism, 380, 397, *cf.* 382; and Mazdæism, 376, 381; and Nationalism, 383
the Church and the World, 3-5, 112 f., 131, 357 f., 419, 430, 451
Christology: biblical basis of, 223, 262; ambiguity of terminology, 223, 225 f., 239, 245; recognized at Antioch (*c.* 433), 262; differences of East and West, 224 f., 309; Diphysite, 224, 281; Monophysite, 222, 224, 305, 340 f., 349, 352, 391; popular, 226, 246, 341
Adoptionism, 123, 230, 235; modalism, 27, 341
Creed of Nicæa (325), 223, 245, 313, 335, 352; Consubstantialist formula of Antioch (A.D. 363), 372; Cyril's Letters to Nestorius, 237, 245; Creed of Ephesus (431) and Antioch (*c.* 433), 262; Tome of Leo, 286; Definition of Chalcedon, 307; Tome of Proclus, 269; Henotikon (*q.v.*), 349
"Alexandrian," 224 f., 235, 237, 286, 313, 341; "Antiochene," 221 ff., 225, 227, 229, 235, 262, 340, 351 f., 393; "Western," 224 f., 308; "Cappadocian," 224, 231; Persian, 392 f.
Apollinarian, 221 f., 223 f., 266, 278; influence on Cyril, 231, 282; difference from Cappadocian, 224; Arian, 236, 266
Views of Anastasius the priest, 228; Aphraates, 380; Athanasius, 224 f., 231, 260; Basil of Cæsarea, 224 f.; Calendion of Antioch, 352; Pope Celestine, 234 f.; Cyril, vi., 224, 231, 237, 261 f. (*vide infra*); Pope Damasus, 222, 226; Diodore of Tarsus, 222 f., 232, 278; Dioscorus and the Latrocinium, 289; Eusebius and Flavian, 289; Eutyches, 227, 277 f., 280-83, 284 f. (*vide infra*); Gregory Nazianzen, 224, 227; Ibas of Edessa, 273; Pope Leo, 245, 284 ff., 302, 317, 335 (*vide infra*); Leontius, 282; Leporius, 230, 235; Marius Mercator, 284; Noetus, 341; Paul of Samosata, 226, 228 f., 230, 312; Photinus, 226, 230, 312; Proclus, 269; Sabellius, 341; Sahag of Armenia, 372; Tertullian, 225; Theodore of Mopsuestia, 222 f., 228, 232, 250, 278; Theodoret, 262 f., 274, 309, his *Eranistes*, 254, 278
Communicatio idiomatum, 393
Crucifixus pro nobis: formula of Peter the Fuller in "Trisagion," 352; Calendion's addition, 352
Christology—*continued*
Deus natus, 226
Deus passus: used by Pope Damasus, 226; repudiated by Acacius of Seleucia, 392; and Domnus of Antioch, 278; and Theodoret, 278
Forma Dei, forma servi, 221, 286
Homo Dominicus, 226
Hypostasis, 223-25, 266, 393; "Two Hypostases," 223; Cyril's interpretation as "Two Natures," 224
"Hypostatic union," 224, 225, 393
"Christ in Two Persons," 222, 226; Nestorius charged with teaching, 312; relation to views of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus, 222 f., 312
"A Single Christ," formula of Antioch, 223, 262
"The Divine Word the same who is Man," 223
Unus de Trinitate incarnatus, in Tome of Proclus, 269; in Henotikon, 349
"Child of two or three months not God," Nestorius' explanation, 245
Unus de Trinitate passus in carne, 318
"Two Sons," doctrine of, anathematized by Pope Damasus, 222 f.; by Council of Antioch (379), 222, 312; by Theodoret, 309; charged against Nestorius, 312, *cf.* 309; condemned in the Henotikon, 349
Homoiousios, 266
Homoousios, 313
Nature, vi., 222, 224 ff., 232, 245, 280 f., 289, 302, 307 ff., 317, 349, 352, 392 f., 458; use in East and West, 225, 309
Una natura Dei Verbi incarnata: Apollinarian, Monophysite, orthodox, 222; Alexandrian, 225; formula of Cyril, 232, 269, 277, 281, 302, 317; Pope Leo on, 284, 302, 335; Eutyches on, 277 f., 280, 282, 284 f., 335
"Two Natures," 226, 284: rejected by Apollinarians, 222; Cyrillians, 224, 284, 330; Eutyches, 280; in Mesopotamia, 341; rejection attributed to Pope Julius, 282; used by Flavian and Eusebius, 289; by Nestorius, 313; interpreted by Pope Leo, 284 f., 286, 302; attitude of Anatolius, 333; in Pamphylia, 335; defended in Dialogue of Arnobius and Serapion, 458. "*In* two Natures," 306 ff., 335. "*Of* two Natures," 306, 308, 317
"Two Natures, One Person": the Latin solution, 225; in Tertullian, 225; in the Tome of Leo, 286; Definition of Chalcedon, 307 f., 317; Persian form, 392 f.; accepted by Cyril, 262 f., 281; Pope Gelasius on, 254
"Physical" Union, 222, 224 f., 262, 277

Christology—*continued*
"Mother of Christ," preferred by Nestorius, 227, 236, 352
"Mother of God": orthodox meaning of *Theotokos*, 227, 352; as interpreted by Easterns, 253, 262; accepted by Gregory Nazianzen, 227; at Chalcedon, 307; by Theodoret, 309; in the Henotikon, 349; difficulties of Nestorius as to, 227, 229, 232, 236, 238, 312 f.; his acceptance, 236, 238; term anathematized by Dorotheus, 234; not used in Persia, 393
"Mother of Man," Nestorius and, 236, 238
"Temple," 262 f.
Christotokos, 227, 236, 352
Chromatius. *See* Aquileia
Chrysaphius, Grand Chamberlain (441-49): eunuch, 277; supplants Pulcheria, 276; influence with Theodosius II., 276; godson and patron of Eutyches, 276 f.; protects him, 280, 284; attitude to Nestorius, 310 f.; supports Dioscorus and the Latrocinium, 292; executed by Pulcheria, 295
Chrysoretus, Grand Chamberlain (*c.* 431): Cyril's gifts to, 261
Chrysostom, St John (*c.* 347-407), Abp. of Constantinople (398-404): authorities for his history, 51, 61, 64 f., 74; date of title Chrysostom, 75; career at Antioch, 51 ff., 60; made Abp. of Constantinople by Eutropius, 51 f.; consecration by Theophilus, 52; his disciplinary reforms, 52 f., 55; unpopularity, 54 f.; attitude to Arians, 53; influence with Gainas and the Goths, 54; hostility of monks to him, 54, 63; of Antiochus, Severian, and Acacius, 54 f., 64 f., 67, 70, 206; feminine opposition, 54, 61; "elderly coquettes," 61; attitude of Empress Eudoxia, 54, 59, 64 f., 67; action in case of Antoninus of Ephesus, 55, 62 f., 241 f.; receives Nitrian monks accused of Origenism, 55, 58; protest of Theophilus of Alexandria, 55; attitude of Epiphanius to, 59 f.; his character and Chrysostom's, 60; Theophilus and Chrysostom at Constantinople, 61, 64, at the Villa of the Oak, 62; pretensions of Alexandria, 58, 61, 63, 71, 234; costliness of Theophilus' policy, 61, 272; "Synod of the Oak" (403), 62 ff., 211; deposition of Chrysostom, 64, 243; charge of *lèse-majesté*, 61, 64; Acts of the Synod, 71 f.; disturbances, 64 f.; Chrysostom leaves Constantinople, 64 f.; his recall, 65; demands a new Council, 65 ff.; appeal by Theophilus to canons of Antioch, 67 f., 248; riots at Constantinople (404), 68 f.; Chrysostom again in exile, 68 f., 72; fire at Constantinople, 69; burning of St Sophia attributed to him, 69, 72; election of Arsacius, 69; Chrysostom at Cucusa, 69 f., 73; his missionary interests, 54, 70; persecution of Johannites, 68, 71 f., 207; their reception at Rome, 72, 74, 135, 190; sentence on Chrysostom quashed by Innocent, 71 f., 460 f.; Innocent and Theophilus, 71 f., and Chrysostom, 72 f., 74, 156, 207; sends mission to Constantinople to support Chrysostom, 72, 182; Chrysostom at Arabissus, 73; death at Comana, 73, 271; rupture of relations of Rome and Constantinople, 73, 162, 460; Theophilus' attacks on Chrysostom, 74, spread by Jerome, 74, 156; burial of Chrysostom at Constantinople, 271
Attitude of Cyril of Alexandria to Chrysostom, 185, 211, 231, 233; of Cassian, 190 f.; of Nilus, 206, and Isidore, 206, 256; of Atticus of Constantinople, 202 f., 219, 258; of Synesius, 203; of Alexander of Antioch, 207; he replaces him on diptychs, 207; healing of differences at Antioch, 207, and at Constantinople, 271
Chrysostom as writer, vii.; formerly reputed author of *Opus imperfectum in Matthæum*," 122; as biblical student, 60, 206; preacher and speaker, 8, 51 ff., 65 ff., 206; incautious speeches, 61, 64-67; as correspondent, 69 f.; on virtues of Anicia, widow of Probus, 141
Church, the, in primitive times and fifth century, 14; doctrine of, in Tychonius, 79 f.; among Donatists, 91, 97 f.; in relation to the Empire, 1, 3, 21, 350; its universal character, 3, 19, 21; the *militia ecclesiastica*, 2; difference of moral standard, 3; as holding property, 14 f., 17 f.; criticisms on, by Sulpicius Severus, 116
National influences, 22; in Armenia, 369 f., 375 f.; in Persia, 380 f.
Churches, 18, 89, 350: decoration, 12; reading of documents in, 100; building, at Rome and Constantinople (*saec.* iv.), 451 f.; burning by Donatists, 94; rebuilding, 387; in Gaul, 403; destruction by Vandals in Africa, 195; in Persia, 382; confiscation of, 440; building in Iberia, 261; in the Yemen, 399; in desert, 278

Churches—*continued*
of Arians at Carthage, 433 f.; at Constantinople, 53 f., 202, 220 f., 458; at Rome, 458
of Catholic Goths at Constantinople, 53 f.; in Crimea, 54
of Johannites at Constantinople, 202
of the "Little Church" at Antioch, 207
of the "Macedonians" at Constantinople, Cyzicus and Province of the Hellespont, 221
of the Novatians at Alexandria, 453, at Rome, 453

Dedications and Titles—
Alexandria: Cæsareum, 210, 332, 350; church of Quirinus, 332
Antioch: Basilica of Constantine, 207; St Barlaam, 343; "Old" Believers, 207
Carthage: St Agileus, 443; St Cyprian, 433; St Perpetua, 433; Basilica of Faustus, 435; Basilica Restituta, 82, 433
Chalcedon: Basilica of St Euphemia, 51, 66, 299 f., 306 f.; St Peter and St Paul, 62, 66; in Rufinianis, 66; St Mocius, 66
Comana: St Basilicus, 73
Constantinople: Anastasis, 58; ch. of the Apostles, 60, 65, 271, 296; St Sophia, *q.v.*; St Menas, 214
Ephesus: Basilica of St John, 241 f., 247, 287, 290; Mary Church, 244, 452; significance of name, 244
Jerusalem: Holy Sepulchre, 5, 11, 36, 381, (Anastasis) 42.
Rome: S. Agata dei Goti, 458; Anastasia, 458; "The Apostles," 248, 452; San Clemente, 162 ff.; Basilica Crescentiana, 452; of Damasus, 451; Chapel of St John Evangelist, 292; Julius, 137, 451; Lateran, 131 f., 137, 173 f., 292, 407, 452 f.; Liberian, 451 f., 466; San Lorenzo, 173; Marcellus, 173; Marcus, 451; St Mary, 452; St Paul, 109, 173, 452, 468; St Peter (Vatican) 5 f., 131, 137, 173, 257, 458; (without the walls) 109, 452; St Sabina, 452; Silvester, 451; Theodora, 173; S. Vitale, 452
Seleucia: Kokhe, 385
Valarschapat, near: St Hripsime, St Gaiane, and 32 Companions, 368
Withorn: St Martin, 427

Organization: the local church, 14, 21; position of bishop, 14-18, 21; of clergy, 14 ff.; of laity, 15, 52, 191, 208, 219, 329, 403 f., 407 f.; election of bishop, 17 f., 52, 70, 191, 220, 339, 343, 403 f., 463; co-operation of neighbouring bishops, 17 f., 83, 212, 250, 463; function of metropolitan as to elections and consecrations, 130, 177, 204, 375, 408 f., 463; groupings of bishops, the Nicene model, 18; departures from it, 18 f., 22; judicial system, 14 f., 17, 19, 58, 154, 169 f., 279 f., 283, 308, 320, 410; conciliar system, 18-20, 86 ff., 154, 166, 169 f., 236 f., 283, 308, 339, 410, 421, 463 f.; canonical legislation, 19, 165 f., 320, 387, 414; administration of property, 14 f., 18, 148, 177, 250; effect of "capital sentence" on tenure, 160
The local and the Universal Church, 19, 21 f.; development, 22; problems of monasticism, 22-6, 33, 57, 125, 214 ff., 218, 228 f., 270, 306, 324, 420; influence of civil position of metropolitical cities, 19 f., 56, 71, 88 f., 129 f., 161, 241, 320; some disregard of civil limits, 18 f., 129 f., 161, 406 f., 465; Council of Nicæa (325), 318, 321; Council of Constantinople (381), 55, 62 f., 241, 319; Council of Chalcedon (451), 319 ff., 339, 357
Africa, 18 f., 130, 165, 169 f., 177, 389, 435, 463 f.; Britain, 423 f., 426; Gaul, 19, 161, 403, 407, 410, 412, 414, 417, 421, 464; Vicariate of Arles, 161, 407 f., 422, 465; Egypt, 18, 20, 56 f., 203 f., 241 (*see* Alexandria); Northern Italy, 18, 117, 128 f.; Peninsular Italy, 20, 130, 462 f.; and Sicily, 182 f., 462; Spain, 404 ff., 464, 466; jurisdiction of Constantinople, 20, 212, 220, 241 f., 258, 275, 306, 309, 318 ff., 345, 357, 464; Vicariate of Illyricum, 125 ff., 161, 212, 275, 357, 464
Position of Antioch, 19, 247-50, 258, 275, 291, 309, 319, 322, 357, 389, 464, 465; Aquileia, 124, 129, 181 f.; Cæsarea in Cappadocia, 212, 320 f.; in Palestine, 154, 318 f.; Cyprus, 250; Cyzicus, 219 f., 242; Edessa, 19, 291; Ephesus, 55, 241 f., 247 f., 320, 339; Jerusalem, 157, 238, 241, 249 ff., 318 f., 464; Marseilles, 130, 161; Milan, 19 f., 128 f., 412, 463; Ravenna, 129 f.; Vienne, 407, 410 ff., 421
Notification to Rome of Accession of Bp. of Constantinople, 257 f., 294 f.; of Bp. of Alexandria, 329 f., 336; notification to Bp. of Tarsus, 258; recognition of Bp. of Tyre by Constantinople, 275; profession of faith, 295, 329 f.
Arab bishoprics, 396
in Armenia: legendary history of organization, 367 f., 375; relation to Cæsarea, 368, 372 ff., 375; influence of ancient pagan organization in per-

Churches—*continued*
sonnel and endowments, 370 f.; hereditary Catholicate, 371 f.; partial disendowment, 373; affairs set in order by Basil of Cæsarea, 374; effect of partition on organization, 375
in Persia: "Sons of the Alliance," 380; organization of the Catholicate, 386, 389. *See also* Persia
of Arians: at Constantinople, 53 f.; Vandals in Africa, 433, 436 ff., 439 f. *See* Arians
of Novatians, 453
Ciborium, 137
Cilicia: influence of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 185, 211, 261; of Helladius of Tarsus, 261; attitude to deposition of Nestorius, 265; Pelagianizers in, 185, 211; "Cilicia Secunda," 334. *See* Basil the Cilician
Cimbri, 106
Cimmerians, 363
Cincinnatus, L. Quinctius (*saec.* v. B.C.), 139
Circassians, 360
Circumcellions: central home, 102; supporters of Optatus of Thamugad, 84; and of Gaudentius, 102; outrages in Numidia, 81, 84, 91; character, 80, 84, 93, 102; *modus operandi*, 84, 91
Civil Power, 18, 366, 382.
(Eastern Empire), 126; as protector of Christians outside, 382; Official proscription of Arians, 120, 202, 220 f.; of Apollinarians, 222; John of Jerusalem secures order of expulsion of Jerome, 34; Theophilus secures decree of expulsion of Origenists, 40; Eutropius secures election of Chrysostom and his consecration by Theophilus, 52; power of Theophilus with officials, 57 f.; Nitrian monks and secular tribunals, 58 f.; summons of Theophilus to Constantinople, 59; Synod of the Oak (403) invokes the Emperor against Chrysostom, 64; exile of Chrysostom, 69, 191; exile of Cassian, 191; law (404) excluding from churches those not in communion with Arsacius, Theophilus, and Porphyry, 70; proscription of Johannites (405), 71 ff., 135, 202 f., 207; the Court and the memory of Chrysostom, 208, 211, 271; attitude of civil power in Egypt to Cyril, 209 f.; proscription of Messalians, 212; law regulating election of bishops of Cyzicus, 220; law (421) on rights of Constantinople, 275; the court and the choice of Nestorius as bishop, 220; new proscription of heretics (428), 221, 242, 250; court defends Novatians, 221; expulsion of Julian of Eclanum from
Civil Power—*continued*
Constantinople (429), 231; complaints to magistrates at Constantinople against Cyril, 233, 236; the monks ask for a Council, 239; the court and Cyril and the projected Council (430), 236; imperial summons of Council, 237, 240; the imperial representative, 240, 242; his instructions, 242, 244, 247; treatment by Cyril's Council, 244 ff., 247 f.; imperial disapproval, 248; report of Council to the Emperor, 249; the new imperial representative, 251; acceptance of depositions of Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon, 251, 263; their arrest, 251, 255; imperial efforts at conciliation, 251, 253; the government and Nestorius, 253, 255; appointment of Maximian as bishop, 254; the Emperor dissolves the Council, 255; rescript as to Cyril and Memnon, 255; supplication of the Easterns to the Emperor as to Jerusalem (431), 319; government supports Maximian against Nestorians, 258; new efforts at conciliation, 259 f.; the mission of Aristolaus, 259 f., 263 ff., 268; exile and internment of Nestorius, 253, 267, 310 f., 314; proscription of "Simonians," 267; treatment of Irenæus and Photius, 267, 270, 275; imperial letter to John of Antioch, 270; the imposition of peace, 271 f.; reparation to Chrysostom, 271; the ecclesiastical policy of the court, 276; appeal of Domnus of Antioch against Eutyches, 278; new proscription (448) of writings of Porphyry and Nestorius, 278; high-handed deposition of Irenæus of Tyre, 278 f.; confinement of Theodoret to his diocese, 279, 287, 292; intervention in trial of Eutyches at Constantinople (448), 280, 283; efforts of Theodosius II. to reconcile Eutyches and Flavian, 285; exaction of confession of faith from Flavian, 285; enquiry of Chereas, 285, 392; removal of Ibas of Edessa (449), 285 ff., 392; removal of Barsumas, 392; Emperor's programme for a new Council (449), 285-8; instructions of his representatives, 288 f.; force, 289 f.; law of Theodosius (449) approving acts of the Latrocinium, 293, 412; removal of Flavian of Constantinople, 293, 324; treatment of Domnus of Antioch, Eusebius of Dorylæum, and Theodoret, 294, *cf.* 340; the Empress Pulcheria and Pope Leo (449), 296; confinement

Civil Power—*continued*
of Eutyches, 296; project of a new Council, 297, 318; imperial representatives at Chalcedon (451), 299; calling the bishops to order, 300; recommendation of depositions, 301 f.; take no part in proceedings for deposition of Dioscorus, 303; imperial request for a Definition of Faith, 302; insistence of representatives, 306 ff., 318; the Emp. Marcian at the Council, 307 f.; request to Emperor to issue law against decisions of Ephesus (449), 309; clemency of Marcian to Nestorius (451), 314 f.; protests of Pope Leo to Marcian as to claims of Constantinople, 322; imperial edicts (452) in support of Chalcedon, 323 f.; forcible restoration of Juvenal of Jerusalem, 327; Marcian and the monks, 327; confinement of Theodosius, Juvenal's supplanter, 328; forcible maintenance of Proterius as Bp. of Alexandria, 329 f.; petition of the Dioscorians to Marcian (454), 330 f.; petitions and counter-petitions to Emp. Leo (457), 331, 333 f.; the Emperor and the assassins of Proterius, 333; the idea of a new Council, 334; the imperial *questionnaire* as to Chalcedon and Timothy Aelurus, 334 f.; efforts at conciliation, 335; arrest and exile of Timothy Aelurus, 336; respect for Chalcedon imposed in Egypt, 468; Timothy Salofaciol, the "Patriarch of the Emperor," 337; the case of Peter the Fuller, 341 f.; law (471) against monks causing trouble at Antioch, 342 f.; intervention of Zeno on behalf of Catholics of Africa (474), 435; the Emp. Basiliscus recalls Timothy Aelurus, 338; imperial encyclical on doctrine imposed by force, 338; refusal of Acacius to sign, 339, 344; Council in Asia addresses Basiliscus against him, 339; recall of Peter the Fuller (475), 343; government interference at Antioch, 343; the Anti-encyclical, 345; Zeno's order of exile for Timothy Aelurus (477), and recall of Salofaciol, 346; influence of Acacius under Zeno, 347; intervention of Zeno for Catholics of Africa (481), 437; address of Salofaciol to Zeno as to succession to Alexandria, 347 f.; Zeno's Henotikon on doctrine (482), 348 ff.; his recognition of Peter Mongus at Alexandria, 348 f.; intervention to check his proceedings, 350 f.; exiles Calendion of Antioch, and recalls Peter the Fuller, 352; force in Syria and Palestine, 353; imposition of the Henotikon, 391; letter of Felix III. to Zeno as to Acacius, 355; arrest and deception of his legates, 355
Re-organization of ecclesiastical administration in the Caucasus by Justinian, 361

Civil Power (Western Empire): proscription of Donatists in Africa reversed by Julian, 76, 93; Valentinian's policy, 77; Roman Council (378) invokes Gratian against Bp. of "Parma," 130, 466; laws against re-baptism (373, 377, 379), 81; Primianus the Donatist invokes laws against dissenters, 84, 90; municipal councils as mediators among ecclesiastics, 91; Pope Anastasius obtains proscription of Origen's writings, 43; Honorius moved to summon Council at Thessalonica, 72; Council of Carthage (404) invokes laws of Theodosius (392) against schismatic ordinations, 92; decrees for suppression of Donatists (405), 93 f.; edicts of toleration under Jovius (409), 94; African Council (410) asks for its recall, 95; Marcellinus, imperial commissioner, holds conference of Catholics and Donatists (411), 95-9; the decision, 99; new law against Donatists (412), 99; efforts to enforce it at Thamugad, 102; removal of Heros of Arles by civil power only, 160; African Council (418) procures rescript against Pelagians, 166 ff.; Pelagius and Celestius to be expelled from Rome (418), 167; legates of Zosimus and the civil power in Africa, 170 f.; complaints of Africans to Ravenna, 172; the Emperor and the controversy of Boniface and Eulalius, 173 f.; imperial commission to Achilleus of Spoleto, 174; removal of Eulalius, 174; Augustine on Pope Boniface's use of civil power, 177; the Emperor and papal elections, 178; Council of Carthage (423) and Roman use of civil power, 179 f.; imperial edicts (418-19) against Pelagians, 181; opposition in Italy, 181 ff.; laws upheld by Popes, 183, 187; rescript of Placidia against Pelagians in Gaul (425), 187; its execution given to Patroclus, 187; rescript of Valentinian against Manicheans (445), 456; rescript secured by Leo against Hilary of Arles (445), 411, 466; Leo invokes Valentinian III. against Latrocinium (449), 293, 412; Valentinian intervenes on behalf of

Civil Power (Western Empire)—*continued* Catholics in Africa (454), 435; Odoacer and Theodoric and papal requisitions, 467
Claque, at sermons, 209
Claudian, priest at Constantinople (*c.* 430), 260
Claudian, priest of Vienne (*saec.* v.), brother of Mamertus, 421; *De statu animae*, 421
Claudian [Claudianus, Claudius], poet (*fl. c.* 400): celebrity as official poet, 115, 141; on barbarians and food supply, 85
Claudianists, Donatist sect in Proconsular Africa, 80; attitude of Primianus of Carthage to, 83
Claudius, Emp. (41-54), Temple at Rome, 131
Cledonius, 227
Clement of Alexandria (*fl. c.* 190-203), 13
Clemente, San, 162 ff.
Clementianus, monk (*saec.* v.), Arian and Manichean, 437
Clementine Recognitions, 45
Clergy, 216: and laity, 15, 384, 417; ordination as escape from curia, 55; married, 120, 204, 426; attempt to enforce celibacy on, in Rome and Africa, 82; penitents excluded from, 6, 89; professed monks excluded from, in Rome, 26, 159; pursuits of, 408; alleged abuse of preaching, 196; usury, 384; their share in coronations, 331; Gildas on, 430; Sulpicius Severus on, 116
in Africa, Catholics and Arians, 433 f., 440; Catholics and Donatists, 94; in Armenia, 373; in Britain, relations with monks, 424; at Constantinople, under Chrysostom, 52, 54; of Ephesus, appeal to Chrysostom, 55; of Gaul, appeal to Rome, 408 f., resistance to barbarians, 417; in Persia, 383 ff.; canons of Antioch (*c.* 325-41) on rebellious clergy, 305; parochial, 452; and sacraments, 15 f.
Clichy, 123. *See* Councils
Clovis, King (481-511), 418
Codex Canonum, 86 f., 169, 171, 176, 179, 466
Codex Justinianus, 14, 278, 342, 442
Codex Theodosianus, 14, 17, 53, 70, 76, 81 f., 92 ff., 99 f., 267, 275, 411, 466
Codonatus, John. *See* John
Coining, 450
Colchis, 361
Cold River. *See* Frigidus
Collectio Avellana. See *Avellana*
Collectio Hibernica, 189
Cologne, Franks at, 105, 402 f.; MS. of Councils at, 408
Colony, Colonies: of Britons in Spain, 423; Greek in the Caucasus, 360; Israelite in Arabia, 397; Jewish, at Alexandria, 209, on the Euphrates, 380; of Persian Christians in Hindustan, 399 f.; of Jerome and his friends at Bethlehem, 34; of Syrians for commerce, 128, *cf.* 399; of ascetics at Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, 216
Comana, Chrysostom at, 73, 271
Combs, 438
Comes Domesticorum, 242, 299, 361
Comes Orientis, 57
Comes Sacrarum Largitionum, 251
Commerce: Alexandrian with Rome, 457 f.; Jewish and Syrian, 128; Greek, 360, 385; Indian, 396; Roman, in Yemen, 399
Comminges, 119, 417
Communicatio idiomatum, 393
Communion, admission to, 77, 83, 88, 89, 263, 350, 410
Como, bishopric founded by St Ambrose, 128. *See* Abundius, Felix
Concordia, 413
Confessors, in Africa, 442; in Palestine, 36; at Rome, 26
Confirmation, imposition of hands in, 89; problem in case of schismatics, 89; unction, 131
Confiscation, of churches, 92, 440; of property, 71, 92, 267, 440
"Conscience, cases of," 133
Consecration, refusal of, 177. *See also* Bishops, Church organization in Africa
Constans, Emp. (337-50), son of Constantine the Great, 76
Constans, son of Constantine III., usurper in Gaul, 109 f.
Constantina, Church burnt by Donatists, 94; resistance to Vandals at, 195; persecution, 436. *See also* Petilian, Antoninus Honoratus
Constantina, bishopric in Asia, 353
Constantine the Great (*c.* 274-337), time of, Emp. (307), sole Emp. (324-37), 400: blunder of Agathangelus as to, 368; buildings at Rome, 12, 451 f., and Constantinople, 12; Baths at Constantinople, 68; enclosure at Constantinople, 202, 458; transport of Muses of Helicon to Constantinople, 69; cathedral at Antioch, 207; commends Persian Christians to Sapor II., 378 f.; hostilities between Persia and Empire (337), 382; introduction of Christianity in Armenia in his time, 361; Donatist schism in Africa (313), 76, 78, 84, 97 ff.; versification of Gospels by Juvencus, 114; Eusebius' *Vita Constantini*, 381

Constantine III., usurper, acclaimed Emp. in Britain (*c.* 408), 107, 423; settles at Arles, 107; invades Italy, 109 f.; supported by Heros of Arles, 110, 117, 160, and by Lazarus of Aix and Proculus of Marseilles, 117; besieged at Arles by Constantius 110; ordained priest, 110; executed (411), 110

Constantinople, 215, 327, 365; enclosure of Constantine, 202, 458; growing importance under Theodosius, 56, 124, 129; prestige as imperial town, 20, 202; under rule of Rufinus (*c.* 395), 49 f.; growth in size under Anthemius (*c.* 405-17), 202; Gainas and the Goths, 50 f., 54, 203; imperial circle, 54 f.; resort of Syrian bishops 54 f.; Nitrian monks (401), 55, 58 f.; Epiphanius at (403), 59 f.; Theophilus of Alexandria there (398) 52, (403) 61, 64; affrays between Egyptians and people, 65; Synesius there (*c.* 400), 203; disturbances (404), 68 f.; fire, 69; Celestius at (*c.* 417), 162; Julian of Eclanum at (*c.* 424), 185; Galla Placidia takes refuge there (*c.* 423-25), 187, 401; projected visit of Stilicho (*c.* 408), 201; regency of Anthemius (*c.* 408-17), 201 f.; Isidore of Pelusium formerly an official at, 205; Orestes, Augustal Prefect, formerly baptized there by Atticus, 210; baptism of Eudocia (421), 276; Alexander the Messalian there, 214; Peter the Iberian hostage there (422), 325; Melania the younger there, 325, 451; Volusianus, her uncle, there (436), 451, his baptism, 451; fire in Arian disturbance (428), 221; Apollinarians there, 227; return of Julian of Eclanum and Celestius (*c.* 429), 229; Marius Mercator there, 231, 284; Alexandrian clergy there (*c.* 429), 233; delay of news from Hippo (430, Aug. 28 to Nov. 30), 243; reports of Candidian from Ephesus, 246, 248; intrigues of Cyril at (*c.* 430), 236, 252; Cyrillian deputies invited there (431), 254; final burial of Chrysostom (438), 271; denunciations of Domnus and Theodoret at, 277; Evagrius the historian there (*saec.* vi), 316; Juvenal of Jerusalem at (*c.* 453), 326; coronation of Zeno (474), 337; Timothy Aelurus there (*c.* 476), 338; Martyrius of Antioch (*c.* 470), 342; John Talaia there (*c.* 482), 347 f.; legates of Pope Felix III. imprisoned (484), 355; the "defensor" Tutus there (484), 358 f.; Jahbalaha, Persian Catholicos, there (417-18), 387; protests against persecution of Persian Christians, 388; threatened invasion of Attila (452), 414; Julius Nepos, last Emperor, sent from there to West (474), 416, 449; failure of expedition against Vandals in Africa (442), 432, and of that under Basiliscus (468), 432; refugees from Africa there, 433, 442; attitude there towards barbarians, 447; Ricimer and Emp. Leo, 448; relations with Theodoric, 450 f.; bishops gather there on restoration of Zeno (477), 345; Mahomet II. in St Sophia (1453), 104

Court and ecclesiastical policy: Theodosius I. and Council (of 381), 319; influence of Eutropius in appointment of Chrysostom (398), 51 ff.; hostility of Eudoxia (399), 54; fluctuation, 59, 61 f., 64 f., 67; Arcadius and Chrysostom, 62, 68 f., 70, 72; policy of Anthemius and of Theodosius II., 201 f., 208, 220; affairs of Persia (422), 388; Novatians protected against Nestorius, 221; Theodosius II. and Cyril of Alexandria, 236; summons for an Œcumenical Council, 236 f., 240; Imperial representatives at Council of Ephesus (431), 240, 242, 244 ff., 247 ff., 251; Theodosius and the Council, 252-55, 259 f., 263, 265; Cyril and the Court, 260 f.; Theodosius and the Nestorians, 266 ff., 270, 272 f., 276, 278; reparation to Chrysostom (438), 271; the Theodosian Code (438) and the question of Illyria, 275; influence of Chrysaphius, 276 f., 280, 310 f.; Theodosius and Domnus of Antioch, 278 f.; further proscription of "Nestorians" (448), 278 f., 285, 310 f.; protection for Eutyches, 280, 285; new Œcumenical Council summoned, 285; Pope Leo and Theodosius, 286, 292; imperial representatives at Ephesus (449), 287 ff.; Theodosius approves the "Latrocinium," 293 f.; exile of Flavian of Constantinople, 293; death of Theodosius (450), 295; accession of Pulcheria and execution of Chrysaphius, 295; her marriage with Marcian, 295; the new policy, 296; Pulcheria and Pope Leo, 296 f., 318, 322; new Council summoned, 297; Marcian and the Council of Chalcedon (451), 298 f.; demand for a Definition of Faith, 302, 304, 306 f., 318; Marcian at Chalcedon, 307 ff.; clemency for Nestorius, 314 f.; Marcian and Pope Leo, 323; troubles with Eudocia, 325-28; the

Constantinople—*continued*
problem of Jerusalem, 327 f.; difficultiesin Egypt, 330 f.; death of Pulcheria (453) and Marcian (457), 331; influence of Aspar, 331, 334; the Emp. Leo and Egypt, 331-34; question of a new Council, 334; shifting of opinion, 336; death of Aspar, and of Emp. Leo (474), 337; Zeno and Basiliscus, 337 f.; the "Encyclical," 338, 344 f.; Zeno at Antioch, 342 f.; fall of Basiliscus (476), 345; Zeno and Genseric and the treatment of Catholics in Africa, 435; Zeno and Acacius, 347 f.; the "Henotikon," 348 ff., 391 f.; demonstrations at Alexandria, 350; Leontius accepted as Emp. in Syria, 352; Zeno and Acacius and the affairs of Egypt (482), 354; Rome and Constantinople and the rupture between West and East (484), 354-59
Church of C., 56, 393: decline of discipline under Nectarius (381-98), 52; revival by Chrysostom, 52 f., 64; his relations with Arians, 53 f., and with Catholic Goths, 53 f.; clergy and the Synod of the Oak (403), 64; schism in the matter of Chrysostom, 68, 70 f., 74, 202 f., 258; efforts of Alexander of Antioch to heal it, 207, 211; views of Atticus, 202 f., 211 f., 219; divisions after death of Atticus (425), 219 f.; dislike of Nestorius' Syrians, 228; Antiochene theology, 230 f.; Cyril's letter on deposition of Nestorius, 246; divisions, 252, 258, 260, 313; appeal from Armenia, 269, 390; Basil the deacon and Theodore of Mopsuestia, 269; proscription of Nestorian clergy (Simonians), 267; relations with Church of Persia (420), 387; toleration of Novatians, 202, 453; treatment of Arians, 53 f., 58, 202, 211, 220 f., 229, 458; "a Greek Papacy," 460; the resort of bishops, 462; gathering of bishops (477), 345; Timotheus of Constantinople on the Marcianites (Messalians), 213
Jurisdiction over Ephesus, 55, 63, 339; proposals to exercise it over Alexandria, 59; scruples of Chrysostom, 62 f.; in Asia, 219 f., 221, 242, 258, 275, 319 f., 357; still undefined by Councils (in 425), 220, *cf.* 258; pretensions in Illyria supported by law (421), 275, 465; Acacius and Illyricum, 357; in affairs of Antioch, 309, 319, 343, 357; canons of Chalcedon, 320 f., 339, 357; devotion of Anatolius to them, 333; local jurisdiction, 306; consecration of metropolitans by Patriarch, 463, 464; Basiliscus and patriarchal rights, 345
Monasticism: turbulence of monks there, 23; restrictions, 24; Evagrius of Nitria there, 28; Isidore sent there by Theophilus, 39; attempts to make him bishop (398), 39, 58; Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius there, 42; Isaac the Syrian founds monastery, 54, 215; charges against Chrysostom, 54, 63; Nitrian monks there (401), 55, 58 f.; Armenians, 270, 390; influence of Acœmeti, 214 f.; growth of monasteries, 215; attitude to Patriarch, 216; influence of Eutyches, 227, 253, 276 f.; his trial and deposition, 280 f., 296; acceptance of condemnation exacted by Flavian, 283; intervention of the Emperor, 285, 287 ff.; letters of Pope Leo to monks, 286, 292; monks at Nicæa, 297, expelled, 298; Eutychian monks at Chalcedon, 305 f.; Theodosius, Bp. of Jerusalem, placed in monastery of Dius, 328; its Chalcedonian sympathies, 328; opposition of other monks, 328 f.; Anatolius' attitude to "Eutychians," 333; opposition of monks to Timothy Aelurus, 338; Acœmeti favour Chalcedon, 342 f.; they hold Peter the Fuller in custody, 343; relations with Pope Felix III., 355, 358; influence of David the Stylite, 344 f.
Relations with Alexandria, v.: under Athanasius, 239; under Theophilus, 39, 42, 55; ancient rivalry, 56 f., 58 f.; Alexandrian candidates for see of Constantinople, 39, 58, 294; Theophilus summoned before Chrysostom, 59, 62; he deposes Chrysostom, 64, 71, 203; Cyril's view of Chrysostom, 185, 211; Cyril's reputation at Constantinople, 209 f.; his view of Atticus, 219; Nestorius and Cyril, 231 ff., 235 ff., 246, 255, 256, 260, 313; Cyril and Maximian, 260, 263 f., and Proclus, 268; Dioscorus and Flavian, 287-91; Proterius and Constantinople, 330 f.; schemes of Timothy Aelurus, 330, 334; relations with Acacius, 344 ff.; Acacius and John Talaia, 348, and Peter Mongus, 350 f.
Relations with Africa, 175 f.
Relations with Antioch, 208, 211, 309, 319, 343, 357
Relations with Aquileia, 71
Relations with Carthage, 162
Relations with Ephesus, 55, 63, 241, 339
Relations with Milan, 71 f.

Constantinople—*continued*
Relations with Rome: Pope Damasus opposes election of Gregory Nazianzen, 126; question of Illyricum, 124, 126; Chrysostom and Innocent, 71 ff., 156, 461; mission of Æmilius of Beneventum, 72, 182; rupture of relations with Chrysostom's successors, 73 f., 156, 162, 202; mission of the priest Boniface, 173; *Tractoria* of Zosimus, 181; Atticus and Zosimus, 185; the Illyrian question, 212; favourable attitude to Atticus, 219; Nestorius and Pope Celestine, 229, 235 f.; Celestine's view of Nestorius, 234 ff., 267, 461; Roman legates at Constantinople, 254, 258, 452; Celestine and Maximian, 254, 257; Xystus III. and Proclus as to Illyria, 275; Pope Leo and Flavian as to Eutyches, 284, 286, 292, 295, 296 f., 302; Pope Leo and Anatolius, 295, 309, 333 f.; legates to Constantinople, 295, 297 f.; at Chalcedon, on jurisdiction of Constantinople, 320 f.; protests of Leo, 322 f.; Acacius and Pope Simplicius, 330, 345, 346 f., 354, 469; Felix III. and Acacius, 354 f.; legates to Constantinople, 355; their imprisonment and defection, 355 f.; deposition of Acacius by Pope Leo, 354 ff., 357, 359; rupture between East and West, 355-59, 469
Bishops: Eudoxius (360-70), Arian, 211; Gregory Nazianzen (381), *q.v.*; Maximus intruded (*c.* 380-81), 58; Nectarius (381-98), 28, 51 f., 69; Chrysostom (398-404), *q.v.*; Arsacius (404-5), 69 ff.; Atticus (406-25), *q.v.*; Sisinnius (425-27), *q.v.*; Nestorius (428-31), *q.v.*; Maximian (431-34), *q.v.*; Proclus (434-46), *q.v.*; Flavian (446-49), *q.v.*; Anatolius (449-58), *q.v.*; Gennadius (458-71), *q.v.*; Acacius (471-89), *q.v.* *See* Photius
Councils: Second Œcumenical (381), 19; canons, 55, 62 f.; and Illyricum, 125; on jurisdiction, 55, 62 f., 241, 319 f., 339; Creed read at Chalcedon, 302; cited in the Henotikon 348; canon re-affirmed at Chalcedon, 321; Council belauded by Martyrius of Antioch, 353; ignored at Rome, 322
(In 426), trial of Alexander, 214
(In 448), trial of Eutyches, 280 f., 282 ff., 288 f., 349; its records, 285, 289, 301, 312
Fifth Œcumenical (553), 268 f., 271
Buildings: Baths of Constantine, 68; Church of the Anastasis, 58; Basilica of the Apostles, 60, 65; burial place of Patriarchs, 211, 270, 296; Church of St Menas, 214; of St Sophia, *q.v.*; of Catholic Goths, 53; of Macedonians, 221; chapel of Arians, 220 f.; Customs House, 72; Hebdomon, 59; Hippodrome, 337; Marianæ, 65; monastery of Isaac, 54, 215, 252; of Dius, 215, 328, 358; Museum of St Irene, 66; Octogonium, 338; Palace of Eudoxia, 65; of Placidia, 61; of the Senate, 66; burnt, 69; Muses of Helicon in, 69
Constantius, Bp. of Uzès (*c.* 445), 411
Constantius, son of Constantine the Great, Emp. (337-61), 124, 424; and Donatists of Africa, 76, 81; ecclesiastical tyranny, 279; founds Amida (340), 365; hostilities with Persia, 372; siege of Nisibis, 382; mission of Theophilus the Indian, 398 f.
Constantius, Emp. (Feb. 8 to Sept. 2, 421), general of Honorius (410), besieges the usurper Constantine III., at Arles, 110; Victor against Goths, 160; "Saviour of the Empire," 111, 160; Consul II., 160; marries Galla Placidia (417), 111, 160, 175, 187; Patrician, 166; Vice-Emperor, 407; favours Patroclus of Arles, 160 f., 407; proclaimed Emperor, 175; letter to Volusianus, 181; doctrinal sympathies, 166, 175; death, 175; children, 187
Constantius, priest of Antioch (*c.* 404), 70
Constantius, priest of Lyons (*c.* 480), 189
Constantius, Spanish monk (*c.* 431), 312
Constantius, former Vicarius, *Servus Christi* (*c.* 418), 167
Consubstantialist, 372
Consul, 50 f., 54, 114, 140, 160, 457
Consularis [105], 114
Convenae, 119
Conventicula, 451
Conventus, 405
Conversion, 10, 20, 85 f., 118, 128, 193, 213, 369 f., 387, 399, 421, 456
Copiatae, 16
Coptic, v.
Copts, hatred of Hellenism, v., 30
Coquettes, 61
Corinth, 105, 125. *See* Epictetus
Corn, 61, 329, 432
Coronation, 331, 337, 351 *cf.* 382, 448
Coroticus, sub-regulus, Letter of St Patrick to, 426 f.
Corsica, 432, 441, 447
Cos. *See* Julian, Bp. of
Cosenza, 109
Cosmas, Imperial official sent to Alexandria (*c.* 482), 350 f.

Cosmas Indicopleustes (*saec.* vi.), 399 f.
Costume, of bishops, 177, 409; of Vandals, 437 f. *See* Dress.
Councils, List of :—
(1) Africa : Bagai in Numidia, Donatist (394 A.D.), 83 f. ; Byzacene (386 ?), 130, (418 ?), 169; Cabarsussi, in Byzacena, Donatist (393), 83, 85 ; Cæsarea in Mauritania, conference with Donatists (418), 101, 168
Carthage : Donatist (330 ?), 77. Under Gratus (348), 86f., 172. Under Genethlius *in Praetorio* (387 ?), 82, 86 f. ; in "Basilica Restituta" (390), 82, 86 f. ; Donatist against Primianus (392-93 ?), 83 ; Provincial Council (394), 88. Under Aurelius, on treatment of Donatists (397), 86, 88 ; (of 401 June, Sept.), 86, 89 f., 466 ; (402-8), 86 ; (of 403, Aug.), 90 f., 95; (of 404, June), 92 ; (of 404, Aug.), 93 ; (of 407), 101, 169, 208, 466 ; (of 408), 94 ; (of 410), 95 ; (of 411, May) "Collatio cum Donatistis," 95-99, 100 f., 439 ; (of 411), against Celestius, 148 f., 150, 153 f., 157, 163 ; *Concilium Carthaginense IV*, identity of, 86 ; (of 416 ?), 157 ; (of 418, May), 87, 101, 171 ; (of 419, May), 86 f., 175 f. ; (of 424 ?) condemnation of Apiarius, 178 f. ; (of 484), Arians and Catholics, 439 f., 444 ; (of 525), 86
Hadrumetum in Byzacena (394), 88 ; Hippo, under Aurelius of Carthage (393), 85, 87, 88 ; Milevum, in Numidia (416 ?), 157 ; Numidian (403 ?) Donatist, 91 ; (411 ?) ; Catholic, 101 ; Telepte in Byzacena (418), 87
(2) Alexandria. *See* Egypt
(3) Armenia : at Aschdischad under Narses (364-67 ?), 373 ; Valarschapat (491), 391
(4) Asia Minor (excluding Chalcedon, Cilicia) : Ancyra (314 A.D.), 19, 387
Ephesus, *q.v.*
Gangra (340 ?), 19, 387
Neocæsarea (315), 19, 387
Nicæa, *q.v.*
Perga (*saec.* v.), 334 f.
Seleucia, semi-Arian (359), 440
(5) Balkan Peninsula
Sardica (343), 123, 126: intended to be œcumenical, 463 ; signatures of Italian bishops at, 129 ; rehabilitates Athanasius, 424 ; discussions of authenticity of canons, 171 f. ; unknown to African bishops (*c.* 418), 171 ; Gratus of Carthage present at Council, 78 f., 172 ; the question of Thessalonica, 125 f. ; canons added at Rome to those of Nicæa, 19, 171 f., 175, 179, 323 ; letter of "Eastern" Council to Donatus of Carthage, 78, 171 ; and to Maximus of Salona, 124 ; Martyrius of Antioch on the Council, 353 ; Council regarded as Arian in Africa, 172
Sirmium (357), 424 ; (358), 79
Spoleto (418), intended Council, 173, 175 ; not held, 174
(6) Constantinople (including Chalcedon, etc.)
Constantinople, *q.v.*
Chalcedon, *q.v.*
The Oak (403), 216 ; presided over by Theophilus of Alexandria, 62 ff., 211 ; deposition of Chrysostom, 63 f. ; Cyril present at, 211 ; decision annulled by Pope Innocent, 71, 460 f.
(7) Gaul
Angers (453), 414
Arles (314), 16, 424, 463 ; "Second Council of Arles," 123 ; "Code of Arles," 86 ; (455), 25 f., 420 ; (473-4 ?), 421
Besancon ? (445), 410
Clichy (627), 123
Orange (441), 408
Orleans (538), 123
Riez (439), 408
Tours (461), 414
Vaison (442), 408
Vannes (465), 414
(8) Italy, North, 124
Aquileia (381), 124, 125, 463
Ariminum (359) : influence of Restitutus of Carthage, 78 ; estimates of members present, 440 ; many African bishops there, 79 ; British bishops at, 425 ; Athanasius and, 78 ; Martyrius of Antioch and, 353 ; opinions in Rome, 77 ; effects at Constantinople, 53. *See* Creeds.
Milan (451), 412
Turin (*c.* 400), 117 f.
(9) Italy, Central, and Rome
Capua (391) : intended to be œcumenical, 463 ; respect for, in Africa, 82 ; on treatment of Donatists, 88 ; on Bonosus, 122 f.
Rome, 19, 283 ; (in 378), 130, 411 ; (in 382) intended to be œcumenical, 463. (In 386), 21 ; on ecclesiastical celibacy, 82 ; on ordination, 130. (In 417), 162 ff. ; (in 430), 234 ; (in 465), 21 ; (in 484), deposition of Acacius, 355, 358 ; (in 487), 441
(10) Persia
Beit-lapat (484), in Susiana, 392
Maktaba (422 ?), 389, 391
Seleucia (410), 386 f. ; (420), 387

Councils—*continued*
(11) Spain
Elvira (*c.* 300) forbids images and pictures in churches, 12, 34
Tarraconensis (*c.* 465), 466
Toledo (400), 5, 113, 404
(12) Syria and Cilicia with Palestine
Antioch (264 ?), 318; (269) condemns Paul of Samosata, 228. (*c.* 341 ?), 387; canons of discipline, 67 f., 305; challenged at Constantinople (404), as imposed by Arians, 68; (363), 372; (379), 222; (381), 222 f.; (*c.* 418 ?, 424 ?), condemnation of Pelagius, 168; (*c.* 482 ?), 353
Diospolis (415), 319; acquittal of Pelagius, 154 f., 158, 206; a "miserable synod," 157
Jerusalem (415), 153 f.
Laodicea (380 ?), 10, 19, 387
Tarsus (431), 258 f.
Tyre (335), 126; (449), 309
Creationism, 186
Creeds and formularies
Anomœan in Arabia (*saec.* iv.), 399
Antioch (363), Consubstantialist, signed by Sahag of Armenia, 372
Ariminum (359), 438, 458
Chalcedon, Definition of Faith (451), 302, 304, 306 ff., 309 f., 316 f., 330, 345, 349, 393
Constantinople (381), read at Chalcedon, 302; accepted in Henotikon, 348
Egyptian, Creed presented at Chalcedon, 304
Henotikon, the (482), 348 f., 351 ff., 355, 391 f.
Leo, Tome of (449). *See* Leo
Nicæa (325), Creed of: Antiochene gloss on, 223; read at Ephesus (431), 245, 257; re-affirmed, 250, 289; Acacius of Berœa and, 260; Letter of Athanasius to Epictetus and, 260; creed read at Chalcedon, 302; Dioscorus of Alexandria and, 305; monks at Chalcedon and, 305 f., 326; Cyril's teaching identified with, 326; Synod of Perga and, 335; accepted in Henotikon, 348; acceptance in Persia, 386; recital in the Mass, 352
Persian (486), 392; relation to Formula of Union and Definition of Chalcedon, 393
Philadelphia, Creed of: creed of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 250; "Nestorian," 250
Proclus, Tome of (437), 269
Rufinus "of Palestine," confession of, 146
Sirmium, Formula of (357), 424
Spanish Creed, 405
Creeds and formularies—*continued*
Union, Formula of (433); drawn up at Antioch, 262, 264; by Theodoret, 263; based on a Creed of Ephesus (431), 262; accepted by Cyril, 262 ff., 281 f.; view of Ibas of Edessa on, 273; and of Theodosius II., 276; later repudiation of (448), 279; Tome of Leo and, 286; relation of Acacius Catholicos of Persia to, 393
Cremona, 129. *See* Eusebius
Crescens, Primate of Byzacena (*saec.* v.), 434
Crescentiana, Basilica, 452
Cresconius, grammarian and Donatist (*c.* 409), 83, 90, 172
Crete, 125, 127
Crimea, 336; Catholic Goths in, 54, 360. *See* Cherson
Crocus, Gallic bishop (*saec.* v.), identity of, 417
Crucifixus pro nobis, 352
Ctesiphon, correspondent of St Jerome (415), 151, 206
Ctesiphon in Chaldæa: a Persian capital, 365, 377, 384, 388; bishopric of Seleucia - Ctesiphon, 381 ff. *See* Seleucia
Cubiculariae, 260, *cf.* 49
Cucusa, 69 f., 73
Cultus, 377: of martyrs, 10, 115; of angels, 10; of apostles, 11; of saints, 9, 11, 12, 115; of images, 11, 12, 34; of relics, 11, 12, 119; of symbolical animals, 10
Culusi, 96
Curator, 17
Curia 17, 55, 91, [99], 434
Curiales, 433
Cursus honorum, 416, 418
Cyclades, 125
Cyprian, St, Bp. of Carthage (248-57), 81, 86, 113, 146, 437; sanctuary of, 433
Cyprian, African bishop (*saec.* v.), 435
Cyprus, 334: Jerome and Paula in, 30; letter of Theophilus of Alexandria to bishops of, 41; Pope Innocent on relations with Antioch, 250; autonomy of church, 250; burial of Theodosius of Jerusalem in, 328. *See* Epiphanius
Cyrenaica, 203
Cyril, Bp. of Alexandria (412-44), Chap. ix *passim*, 205, 228, 298, 339 f., 346, 461; nephew of Theophilus, 209, 211, 231, 237, 272; the "dynasty" of Theophilus in Egypt, 272; succeeds him as Patriarch (412), 209; the "claque" at his sermons, 209; his attitude to Jews, 209; relations with the Augustal Prefect, 209 f.; the case of Hypatia,

Cyril, Bp. of Alexandria—*continued*
210; attitude to Pelagianism [145], 185; treatment of Novatians, 453; relations with Carthage, 171; his character, vi., 209; Isidore and, 206; parallel with Athanasius, 239; modern attitude to him, 145
Cyril's presence at Council of the Oak (403), 211; his reputation at Constantinople, 209; his secretaries there, 231, 233; his physician, 252; Cyril and Chrysostom, 185, 211; and Atticus, 211; and Nestorius, 231; First Letter to Nestorius, 232; Second Letter (*Epistola Dogmatica*), 233, 245, 295, 302 f.; Cyril and Celestine, 234 f., 243; Nestorius and Cyril, 232 f., 235 f.; citation of Nestorius, 237; Cyril and the Court, 236, 251, 260 f.; Cyril and Acacius, 237, 261; and the Syrians, 238; and John of Antioch, 238, 302 f.; summoning of the Council of Ephesus (431), 239; Cyril's measures, 240; supporters on either side, 240-43; the Council, 243-45, 248-51; deposition of Nestorius, 246; Cyril's defence of his action at the Council, 246 f.; his opposition to the pretensions of Jerusalem, 319; Cyril and the Easterns, 247; deposition of Cyril, 247, 249 f., disregarded, 247; the papal legates and Cyril, 248 f.; Cyril's deposition accepted by the Court, 251; baksheesh, 252; Isidore and Cyril, 206, 256; attitude of the monks at Constantinople, 252 f.; efforts at conciliation, 253 ff.; his escape from Ephesus, 255; his deposition again pronounced by the Easterns, 258 f.; Aristolaus as peacemaker, 259, 265, 268; Cyril's accommodations, 262 ff., 281; "Let the heavens rejoice," 264; dissatisfaction at the "peace," 265, 270; Cyril and Maximus, 266; views of Ibas of Edessa, 273, 309; and of Rabbulas, 273, 390; and Xenaias, 392; Monophysites and Cyril, 266; Cyril and the Easterns once more, 268 f.; death of Cyril (444), 271; the Court and his memory, 278 f.; the monks and his memory, 324
The Anathemas, 237 f.; refutations by Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Andrew of Samosata, 239, 256; Nestorius' counter-anathemas, 239; difficulty of the Anathemas, 256 f.; relation of Theodoret to Cyril, 273, 300, 309; and of Eutyches, 253, 277; the Anathemas accepted by the *Latrocinium* at Ephesus (449), 291; disregarded at Chalcedon (451), 303, 313, 317; accepted in the Henotikon (482), 349
Christology of Cyril, vi.; its relation to the Cappadocians, 231; affinities of his Formula, 232; his theology, 261 ff., 281 f., 302; Tome of Leo and, 286
Pope Leo and Cyril's "Dogmatic Letter," 295; Flavian at Chalcedon and Cyril's teaching, 301; his Letters to Nestorius read at Chalcedon, 302; Leo and Cyril, 302 f., 307; the vanquished at Chalcedon shelter under Cyril, 308
The issue between Cyril and Nestorius, 313 f.; between Leo and Cyril, 286, 307, 317 f., 326, 335
Cyril, Armenian bishop (*c.* 373), 374 f.
Cyril, Bp. of Jerusalem (*c.* 351-86), 31, 155
Cyril of Scythopolis (*c.* 555), 326, 353, 396
Cyril, Abbot of the Acœmeti (*c.* 484), 355
Cyril (*c.* 411), a correspondent of Synesius of Cyrene, 205
Cyrila, Arian, Bp. of Carthage (*c.* 481); and Eugenius of Carthage, 437; his attitude to Catholics, 439 f., 442
Cyrillians, 209: in conference after Ephesus (431), 253 ff.; and writings of Diodore and Theodore, 268 f.; Marius Mercator, 284; their opposition to Chalcedon, 318, 330
Cyrinus, Bp. of Chalcedon (*c.* 401-5); at Council of the Oak, 62; hostility to Chrysostom, 62, 69, 206
Cyrus, Cyrrhos, 274, 353. *See* Theodoret
Cyzicus: in "Diocese of Asia," 219; jurisdiction of Constantinople over, 219 f., 242; Macedonians at, 221. *See* Eunomius, Dalmatius, Eleusius, Proclus

DACIA, Diocese of, 125, 334; list of its provinces, 125
Dacia, Provinces of, 106, 120; Dacia Mediterranea, 125, 127; "Interior," 334; "Ripensis," 125; "Ripuaria," 334
Dadiso, Catholicos of Persia (421-56), [273], 388 f.; the Council of Maktaba and, 389, 391
Dalmatia: civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 124 f.; under Marcellinus, 415; under Julius Nepos, 449; ravaged by Vandals, 432; rumoured Pelagianism in, 457; religious problems, 20, 124
Dalmatius, Bp. of Cyzicus (425), 220

Dalmatius: an officer, 215; ascetic inclinations, 5; his influence as a recluse, 252; Cyril and, 260; death (*c.* 440), 277
Damascus: in Phœnicia Secunda, 251, 261; Juvenal of Jerusalem and, 251; Christian developments near, 396. *See* Heracleides
Damasus, Pope (366-84), 237; controversy with Ursinus, 466; alleged Decretal of, 21; as poet, 114, 453; case of Leontius of Salona, 124; opposes Gregory Nazianzen as Bp. of Constantinople, 126; relations with Acholius of Thessalonica, 126; anathematizes Apollinarianism and also Doctrine of "Two Sons," 222; Christology, 222, 226; relation to secular authority, 453; his Basilica, 451
Damnation, 193
Danes, 423
Daniel, Book of, 10
Daniel, Gallic bishop (*saec.* v.), 409
Daniel, the Syrian, (*saec.* iv.), 372
Daniel, Bp. of Haran (*c.* 449), deposed by the *Latrocinium*, 291
Daniel the Solitary at Constantinople (*c.* 476), 344 f.
Dankalis, 396
Danube: barbarian settlements near, 120, 134, 202, 401; crossed by Huns, 50; conflict of Huns and Goths (400), 51; provinces, 20, 120, 401; Latin Scythia, 190 f.; pilgrimages from Danubian provinces to Nola, 115; religious questions there, 20; specimens of Danubian theology, 122. See Cassian, Odoacer
Daphne, 70
Daranalis, 369
Dardanelles, 358
Dardania, 125
Dardanus, Prætorian Prefect of the Gauls (*c.* 409, 413), 168
Darius, Count (*c.* 429), 194
Daventry, 426
David, tower of, 325
Deacons, 81, 83, 127 f.: *levites*, 468; functions, 15 f.; keeping order in church, 14; limitation of number at Rome, 16; as papal legates, 287 (*see* Hilary), 467 (*see* Leo); administering church property, 148; superintending church repairs, 468; marriage of, 120
Signature of Arminius, British deacon at Arles (314), 424; opposition of the deacon Palladius to Pelagians, 425; his ordination as first bishop of the Scoti, 425; Calpurnius, deacon, father of St Patrick, 426; deacons of St Ambrose, 128, 148; Julian (*adolescens*), deacon of Bp. Memor, 182;
Deacons—*continued*
deposed deacon accuses Chrysostom, 63; Paulinus accuses Celestius, 163 f.; the case of Zosimus, 159; Bessula, deacon of Carthage, represents bishop at Ephesus (431), 243; Basil, deacon of Constantinople, 269; deacons of Dioscorus at Latrocinium (449), 293, 330; Peter Mongus, deacon, consecrated bishop (477), 346; Muritta, deacon, godfather of Elpidophorus, 442 f.
Maximus, deacon and monk of Antioch, a trouble to his bishop (*see* Maximus); murder of deacon at Jerusalem, 326; murder of Titus, Roman deacon, 407
Dialogue of Palladius with Theodore, Roman deacon, 51; Pelagius, Roman deacon, on the Three Chapters, 241, 270; Theodosius the deacon, collection of canons, 171; Liberatus, deacon of Carthage, writings of (*see* Liberatus); Leo, Roman deacon, writings (*see* Leo, Pope)
Deaconesses, 52, 69
Dead Sea, 324
Deans, 170, 177, 463 f.
Decentius, Bp. of Gubbio (*c.* 416), Letter of Pope Innocent to, 21
Decius, Emp. (249-51), 104, 440
Decretals, 20 f., 118, 123, 125, 130, 196 f., 199, 463
Decurio, 426
Dedication Festivals, 18, 381, 420
Dedications. *See* Churches
Defensores Civitatis, 17, 466
Defensores Ecclesiæ, 179, 355 f., 358, 466
Delos, 287
Delphinus, Bp. of Bordeaux (*c.* 380-404), 115, 117; baptizes Paulinus (of Nola), 114
Delta, 191, 205
Demetrias: daughter of Olybius and Anicia Juliana, 140, 168; in Africa, 140 f.; dedicated as a consecrated virgin at Carthage (414), 140 f.; eulogies of Jerome, 141; and of Pelagius, 141, 150 f.; return to Rome, 142; attitude of Jerome, 150 f.; correspondence of Augustine with, 168
Demetrias, 250. *See* Maximus
Demetrius, Bp. of Alexandria (*c.* 189-230 ?), and the Indians, 397
Deogratias, Bp. of Carthage (454-7), 435
Deo laudes, Donatist watchword, 352
Derxene, 369
Deserts, 6, 23 f., 38, 41, 72, 78, 113, 191, 205, 210, 213, 217, 232, 267, 278, 324, 362, 395
Deus passus, 352
Deuterius, Bp. of Macriana (*saec.* iv.), relations with Donatus the Great, 77
Devotions, 119 f. *See* Relics

Diarbekir, 365
Dibou, 399
Didymus, kinsman of Theodosius II. (*c.* 408), abortive rising in Gaul, 109
Didymus the Blind (*saec.* iv.), Origenist, 28
Dioceses, Civil: Asia, 55, 219, 241 f., 319 ff., 334, 357; Dacia, 125, 334; Egypt, 57, 334; Macedonia, 125, 334; Orient, the, 57, 250, 274, 334, 343; Pannonias, the, 124; Pontus, 241, 319 ff., 334, 357; Thrace, 320 f., 334, 357
Ecclesiastical jurisdiction in relation to, 55, 63, 125, 219 f., 241, 319 ff., 357
Diocletian, Emp. (284-305), 368; his dislike for Alexandria, 57; rectification of frontier on upper Tigris, 365; annexes part of Armenia, 365 f.; Britain under, 423; proscription of Manicheans, 454; penalties for them, 456
Diodore, Bp. of Tarsus (*c.* 379-*c.* 394): influence in Council of Antioch (381), 222 f.; friend of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 222 f.; inadequate Christology of his works, 222 f.; influence at Antioch, 223; on Nestorius, 268, 312; Ibas of Edessa and "School of the Persians," 273; Theodoret and, 274; Cyril's knowledge of, 232; Cyril's lost attack upon, 269; attacked by Maximus the monk at Antioch, 277; detested by Eutyches, 278, and by Marius Mercator, 284; Monophysite reaction at Antioch against his teaching, 344
Diogenianus, Bp. of Albi (*c.* 406), 117
Diomede the Silentiary (*saec.* v.), 335
Dionysius, Bp. of Alexandria (247-65), spurious letter to Paul of Samosata, 228; correspondence with Armenia, 366
Dionysius, Bp. of Lydda (*c.* 381 ?), 41
Dionysius, general, in Egypt (*c.* 457), 332
Dionysius Exiguus (*saec.* vi.), collection of canons, 87
Dioscorida, 400
Dioscurias, 360 f.
Dioscorus, Bp. of Alexandria (444-451): Cyril's archdeacon, 272; succeeds him, 272; his doctrinal views, 314, 324, 331; forces Cyril's relations to disgorge, 272, 276; reproaches Easterns as to pretensions of Constantinople, 275; influence with the Chamberlain Chrysaphius, 276, 292, 310; alliance with Eutyches, 279, 284, 331, 412, 460; attitude to Domnus and Theodoret, 279, 285, 291, 348; nominated president of proposed Council at Ephesus, 285; the *Latrocinium* (449), his Council, 287-91, 307, 313, 323, 325, 330 f., 412, 468; deposition of Flavian of Constantinople, 289 f., 293, 339, 346; Pope Leo and Dioscorus, 292 ff.; Dioscorus and accession of Marcian, 296; reversal of the *Latrocinium*, 296 f.; Dioscorus and the new Council, 297 f.; he excommunicates Pope Leo, 298, 304, 306, 331; Council of Chalcedon (451), 299 ff., 303 f.; deposition of Dioscorus, 304 f., 306, 322; views of monks of Palestine, 324; Dioscorus in exile, 329 f.; his death (454), 330; his successors at Alexandria, Proterius, 329, Timothy Aelurus, 332 f.; burial at Alexandria, 340; parties there, 348; name of Dioscorus replaced in diptychs, 337
Dioscorus, Bp. of Hermopolis Parva (*c.* 401), a "Tall Brother," 39; compelled by Theophilus to accept bishopric, 39; ill-treated as Origenist, 40, 59; question of his voyage to Constantinople, 42; death, 66; question as to place of burial, 66
Diospolis. *See* Councils, Lydda
Diphysites, 224, 281
Diptychs: at Alexandria, Cyril and Chrysostom's name, 211; Timothy Aelurus and Dioscorus', 337; names of Proterius and Timothy Salofaciol erased, 349 f. At Antioch, Chrysostom's name removed, 207, restored by Bp. Alexander, 207, removed and replaced by Theodotus, 208, 211. At Constantinople, insertion of Chrysostom's name demanded by people, 208, resisted by Atticus, 208, replaced, 208, 211; Nestorius' name erased by Hypatius, 216; Peter Mongus inserted by Acacius, 355; Pope Felix erased, 359
Dir, 369
Diran, King of Armenia (326-37), 371 f.
Direction, 134, 205, 277
Discipline: of deacons, 54, 63, 83, 330; of priests, 54, 149, 213, 330, 421; case of Apiarius, 169; regulations of Zosimus, 170; case of holding schismatic assemblies, 233; of Eutyches at Constantinople, 280; of monks and monasteries, 24 ff., 33 ff., 40, 52, 155, 280, 305 f., 324; monastic views of, 35; usurpations of monks, 125. Chrysostom's enforcement of discipline, 52, 54 f., 63. Alexandrian methods, 40, 204, 210, 233. Roman Church consulted on points of, 20, 88 f., 124, 127, 153, 157 f., Council of Antioch (*c.* 341) on rebellious and seditious clergy, 305.

Discipline—*continued*
In relation to preaching, 196. Ordinances of Roman Council (386) on ecclesiastical celibacy, 82. Excommunication of the advocate Tutus, 359. Penitential discipline as bar to ordination, 89; Donatists and, 77; at Rome, 132. Council of Capua (391) on restoration of Donatists, 88; African Councils and, 88 f. *See also* Excommunication, Reconciliation
Sentences reviewed by Councils, 19; jurisdiction of Councils, 63, 67, 154; Council of Nicæa on appeals, 59, 179. Council of Aquileia (381) upholds Ambrose as to Leontius of Salona, 124. Council of Capua (391) refers heresy of Bonosus to Bps. of Illyria, 123. Council of Turin (*c.* 400) and case of Britius, 117; and of Felix of Trèves, 118; bound by decisions of Ambrose and Pope Siricius, 118. Trial of Pelagius for heresy by Council of Diospolis (415), 154; of Celestius by local Council in Africa (411), 148 f.; his excommunication, 149. Trial of Lucidus for heresy before Council of Arles (473-74) on delation of his bishop, 421
Suspension and deposition of Bonosus for heresy by Illyrian bishops, 123; question of validity of his ordinations, 124, 127
Theophilus restores persons deposed by Chrysostom, 64. Appeal of Nitrian monks to Constantinople, 58; action of Chrysostom, 58. Appeal of Alexandrian clergy to Nestorius, 233; his action, 233. Deposition of bishops by Chrysostom at Ephesus after trial, 55. Regulations of Council of Constantinople (381), 55, 62 f. Deposition of Chrysostom for refusal to appear at "The Oak," 64, 211. Canon of Antioch (*c.* 341) on position of a deposed bishop, 67 f. Effect of deposition, 211. Pope Zosimus on trial of a bishop with lay assessors, 169. Deposition of Nestorius by Council of Ephesus (431), 246; its grounds, 246. Deprivation of Dioscorus by Council of Chalcedon (451), 304; its terms, 304. Deposition and excommunication of Roman legates (484), 355; of Acacius of Constantinople by Felix III. (484), 355 f.; its terms, 356. Deposition of Bp. Papa in Persia, 385; intervention of the "Western Fathers," 385. Deposition of Chelidonius of Besançon by Hilary and Council, 410; its grounds, 410. Papal interventions, *see* Rome, Church of
Discipline—*continued*
African system of discipline, 169 f., 389; Armenian canons, 373; Persian system, 386 f., 389
Donatist Council deposes Primianus of Carthage, 83; appeal to Donatist episcopate of Numidia, 83; deprivation of consecrators of intruded bishop, 84
Lack of discipline in Britain, 430; in Persia, 384 f., 387, 394
Diu, 399
Dius, Monastery of, 215, 328, 358
Divou, 399
Divorce, 3, 132
Docetism, 340
Doctrine, civil power and debates on, 242, 280, 302, 304, 306; development in Persia, 380, 392; Faustus of Riez on, 420; position of Pope Leo in Latin Church as to, 465. *See* Christology
Documents, Official, 91, 99, 174, 441, 444, 455 f.
Domitian, Bp., papal legate (458), 335
Domnio, priest (*saec.* iv.), friend of Jerome, 131
Domnus, Bp. of Antioch (441-51): formerly a monk, 294; nephew and successor of John of Antioch, 273, 278, 294; his views, 273, 278, 283; influence of Theodoret on him, 274, 279, 286; consecrates Irenæus Bp. of Tyre, 275; hostility of ascetics to him, 277, 279; defends views of Diodore and Theodore, 278; relations with the Emperor, 278; his hostility to Eutyches, 278, 283; hostility of Dioscorus of Alexandria to him, 279, 324; at the *Latrocinium* (449), 287; assents to its decisions, 290; illness, 291; ceases to be Bp. of Antioch, 293; becomes a monk again, 294; his successor, 294, 308; pension, 309
Domus Merulana, 458; *Pinciana*, 142
Donatism, Donatists, 179, Chap. iv. *passim*: and Traditors, 77, 91; under Constantine, 97; enforced union (347), 76 f., 92 f.; repression under Constantius, 76, 81; favoured by Julian, 76, 81; violence of triumph, 77; Optatus of Milevis on, 76, 79, 81; enmity of Count Romanus, 78; works of Tychonius, 77, 79 f.; divisions in ranks, 80, 83, 89; strength in Numidia, 80, 82 f., 91; repression after Numidian rebellion, 81; position of Bagai and Thamugad, 82, 102; the Circumcellions, 80 f., 84, 91, 93, 102; intolerance, 81; Gildo and, 82, 88 f.; quarrel with Primianus, 83; number of bishops, 77, 83, 97 f.; appeal to civil power, 84; terms of

Donatism—*continued*
reconciliation, 88-91 ; Augustine and, 90, 92, 99 ff., 121, 147, 176 ; abortive negotiations, 90 f., 95 ; renewal of violence, 91 f. ; measures of repression, 93 ; Law of Union (405), 93 f., 98, 100, 102 ; more violence, 94 ; repression and toleration, 94 f. ; conference under Marcellinus (411), 95-9, 121, 147, 150 ; decision of Marcellinus, 99 ff. ; further repression, 99 ; reversal and temporary triumph, 100 ; Augustine and Emeritus, 101, 168 ; and Gaudentius, 102 f. ; and Donatists of Fussala, 176 f. ; Donatist survivals, 103, 453 ; Donatists and Council of Sardica, 78, 171 ; Council of Capua (391) and, 88 ; Monophysites compared with them in violence, 341 ; *Deo laudes*, 352
Bishops : Pontius, 76 ; Parmenian of Carthage, 78 ff., 82, 90 ; Primianus of Carthage, 82 ff., 88, 91, 96 ; Maximian of Carthage, 83 f., 89 f. ; Salvius of Membressa, 84 ; Optatus of Thamugad, 82 f., 84 f., 88 ; Petilian of Constantina, 90, 96 f. ; Emeritus of Cæsarea in Mauritania, 96, 101, 168 ; Gaudentius of Thamugad, 96, 102 ; bishop at Hippo, 81, 459
Councils, 87 ; Bagai (394), 83 f. ; Cabarsussi (393), 83, 85 ; Carthage (330 ?), 77, (392-93 ?), 83 ; Numidian (403 ?), 91
Donatus, Bp. of Casae Nigrae (*c.* 313), 77
Donatus the Great, Bp. of Carthage (315-50), 91 ; relations with Deuterius of Macriana, 77 ; Council of Sardica and, 78, 171 ; death in exile, 79 ; Maximian, Bp. of Carthage, related to him, 83 ; writings, 78
Door-keepers, 16
Dorians, 203
Dorostorum. *See* Auxentius
Dorotheus, Bp. of Marcianopolis (*c.* 431) : "Nestorian" language of, 234, 237 ; deposed, 258 ; in exile, 266, 314 ; ministers to the dying Nestorius, 315
Dorotheus, Count (*saec.* v.), restores Juvenal of Jerusalem, 327
Dorotheus, monk at Constantinople (*c.* 451), 328
Dorylæum. *See* Eusebius
Dove, 372
Dreams, 10, 299, 426
Dress, 177, 278 : of monks, 22 f., 395, 409 ; Roman, barbarians in, 111, *cf.* 437 f.
Droseria, *cubicularia*, 260
Dualism, 454
Dulcitius, Imperial Commissioner in Africa (*c.* 405), 100, 102
Dulcitius, notary, papal legate (*c.* 449), 287
Durance, 450
Duumviri, 17
Dux, 336, 361
Dynamius, Bp. of Angoulême (*c.* 450), 117
Dyrrachium, 125

Earthquake (458), 341
Eauze, 417
Ebed-Jesu, 273
Eborius, Bp. of York (*c.* 314), 424
Ebro, 406
Ecdicius, general, in Gaul (*saec.* v.), 416
Eclanum, bishopric of, position and history, 182. *See* Julian, Memor
Edessa : position as metropolis, 19, 291 ; in province of Osrhoene, 285, 365 ; Tella dependent on, 291, 435 ; Syriac speech, Semitic culture, 379 ; Alexander the Messalian at, 213 ; School of the Persians, there, 273, 390 f., 393 ; Christian influence in Persia, 379, 385 f. ; imperial inquiry at (*c.* 449), 285 ; legend of St Thaddeus, 367 ; story of King Lucius, 424 ; catechists from, in Armenia, 370 ; MS., Martyrology, from, 384 ; Theodoret's letter to, 435
Bishops : Rabbulas (412-35), *q.v.* ; Ibas (435-57), *q.v.* ; Nonnus (*c.* 449), 392
Edom, 382
Education : of Paula the younger, 133 ; of Paulinus at Bordeaux, 114 ; of Theodoret, 274 ; in Armenia, 373 ; School of the Persians at Edessa, 273, 390 f., 393 ; Julian's edicts, 86. *See also* Alexandria
Egypt, 67, 278, 320, 333 ; Diocese of, 57, 334 ; provinces of, 240 ; administrative history, 57 ; Augustal Prefect, 40, 57 f., 209 f., 329 ; Dux of Egypt, 336
Delta, 191, 205 ; Isthmus, 395 ; mines, 267 ; relations with princes of Saba, 396 ; worship of Isis, 400
Fugitives from Alaric in, 137 ; sailors of, 61, 65, 240, 242, 290, 338 ; Egyptians at Rome, 457 f. ; Emp. Leo and Egyptians, 468 ; Muhammadans in, 226
Church of E. (*see also* Alexandria, Councils) : festivals, 10 ; notaries, 290 ; ecclesiastical organization and influence of Patriarch of Alexandria, 18 ff., 56, 58, 63, 74, 203 f., 241, 255 f., 272, 322 ; bishops under Theophilus, 40, 204 ; under Cyril, 211, 239 f. ; under Dioscorus, 276 f., 287, 298 ; bishops at Chalcedon, 297 ff., 301, 304 f., 324 ; consecration of Timothy Aelurus, 331 ; parties in, after Chalcedon, 333 f., 337

Egypt—*continued*
Palladius and, 29 f., 72; Serapion, an Egyptian Chrysostom's archdeacon, 53; Chrysostom and Egyptian affairs, 62; relations with Palestine, 35; Messalians in, 213; John of Antioch and, 238; Aristolaus in, 259, 263; influence of Eutyches, 277, 351; Nestorius in, 310; Rome and, 322, 460; mission of John the Silentiary, 330 f.; the Henotikon of Emp. Zeno, 348, *cf.* 351; influence of Acacius of Constantinople, 357; Theodore of Antinoe, 350, 354; Isaiah, "the prophet," 354
Monasticism, 240; unrest of monks, 23; theological speculation, 28, 30, 32, 193; anthropomorphism, 32, 38, 40; church in deserts, 278; Nitria (*q.v.*), 28, 30, 41 f., 191; in diocese of Hermopolis Parva, 39; Tall Brothers (*q.v.*), 39, 215; solitaries, 118, 193; influence of Isidore of Pelusium, 205 f., 265, and of Nilus (*q.v.*), 205 f.; Egyptian monks at "The Oak," 215; Rufinus' History, 45 f.
Elche, 464. *See* John
Elea, 219
Electi, 454 ff.
Elephantine, 311
Eleusius, Bp. of Cyzicus (*c.* 356), 221
Eleutherius, Pope (177-89), 424
Eleutheropolis, 10
El Hadr, 394
Elias, Brother (*saec.* xiii.), 116
Elijah, the prophet, 33, 189
Elisha, Armenian historian (*saec.* v.), 376
El Kef, 169
Elpidophorus, apostate (*saec.* v.), 442 f.
Elvira. *See* Councils
Ember seasons, 7
Embrun, 161; see of, 410, 412
Emerita. *See* Antoninus
Emeritus, Donatist, Bp. of Cæsarea in Mauritania (*c.* 411-18): at conference at Carthage (411), 96; conference with Augustine (418), 101 f., 168
Emesa, 395: Bp. of, sides with Chrysostom, 67; Theodoret's letter to bishop, 433
Bishops: Eusebius (*c.* 341-59), 420; Paul (*c.* 431), *q.v.*
Emperors: Augustus (B.C. 29 - A.D. 14), 396; Claudius (41-54), 131; Vespasian (69-79), 363, 365; Titus (79-81), 380; Trajan (97-117), 14, 385; Hadrian (117-137), 106, 423, 427; Antoninus Pius (138-161), 423, 426 f.; M. Aurelius (161-180), 364; Septimius Severus (193-211), 364 f., 385; Decius (249-51), 104, 440; Aurelian (270-75), 106; Carus (281-82), 364; Diocletian (284-305), *q.v.*; Galerius (306-11), 364, 440, 443; Maximin Daia (307-14), 366, 370; Licinius (308-324), 368, 395; Constantine the Great (307), sole Emperor (324-37), *q.v.*; Constans (337-50), 76; Constantius II. (337-61), *q.v.*; Magnentius (350-53), 76; Julian (361-63), *q.v.*; Jovian (363-64), *q.v.*; Valeus (364-78), *q.v.*; Valentinian I. (364-75), *q.v.*; Gratian (375-83), *q.v.*; Valentinian II. (375-92), *q.v.*; Theodosius the Great (379-95), *q.v.*; Maximus usurper (383), 107; Eugenius usurper (*c.* 394), 84 f.
Eastern: Arcadius (395-408), *q.v.*; Theodosius II. (408-49), *q.v.*; Pulcheria (449-53), *q.v.*; Marcian (450-57), *q.v.*; Leo (457-74), *q.v.*; Leo the younger (473-74 ?), 337; Zeno (474-75), *q.v.*; Basiliscus (*c.* 475-76), *q.v.*; Zeno restored (476-91), *q.v.*; Leontius usurper (*c.* 483), 351 f.; Justinian (527-65), *q.v.*; Justin II. (565-78), 213
Western: Honorius (395-423), *q.v.*; Constantine III., usurper (*c.* 408-11), *q.v.*; Maximus, usurper (*c.* 409), 109; Attalus, usurper (*c.* 409), *q.v.*; Jovinus, usurper (*c.* 411), 110, 160; Sebastian, usurper (*c.* 412), 110; Constantius (421), *q.v.*; John, usurper (423-25), 178, 187; Galla Placidia (425-50), *q.v.*; Valentinian III. (425-55), *q.v.*; Petronius Maximus (455), 415, 445 f.; Avitus (455-56), *q.v.*; Majorian (457-61), *q.v.*; Libius Severus (461-65), 415, 448, 468; Anthemius (467-72), *q.v.*; Olybrius (472), 446, 449; Glycerius (473), 449; Julius Nepos (474-75), 416, 449; Romulus Augustulus (475-76), 449
Encyclia, 334 f.
Encyclical. *See* Basiliscus
England, English, 430
Ephesus, 256, 263; its civil importance, 241; ecclesiastical position, 241, 320; relations with Constantinople, 55, 63, 241, 339; Chrysostom's share in its affairs, 55, 62 f., 241 f.; its position as affected by Council of Chalcedon, 321, 339; Celestius as priest of, 149 f., 162; Timothy Aelurus at, 339
Bishops: Antoninus (*c.* 400), *q.v.*; Heraclides (401-4), 62; Memnon (*c.* 431), *q.v.*; Paul (*c.* 476), 339
Churches: Basilica of St John, 241 f., 244, 247, 290; Church of Mary, 244 f., 287, 290; origin of its name, 244

Ephesus—*continued*
Councils: Third Œcumenical (431), 196, 216, 221, 259, 433; summoned by Theodosius II. (November, 430) for Whitsuntide (June 7, 431), 237; Nestorius at Ephesus, 240, 242; arrival of Cyril of Alexandria, 240; of Juvenal of Jerusalem (June 12), 240; his position, 318 f.; arrival of Count Candidian, 242; of bishops of Macedonia, 242; position of parties, 240, 242 f.; Palestinian, Phœnician, Arab bishops, 240 f., 396; legates of Pope Celestine, 170, 242 f., 248, 258, 452; their arrival delayed, 242 f., 288; Bessula, a deacon, sole representative of Africa, 243; absence of Acacius of Berœa, 243; represented by Paul of Emesa, 262; delay of John of Antioch and the Easterns, 243; no representative of Armenia or Persia, 390; premature convocation by Cyril (June 21), 243, 288; protest of bishops, 244, 247, 250. (Session 1, June 22): numbers present, 244; abstentions, 247; protest of Count Candidian, 244 ff.; Nestorius refuses to appear, 244 f.; documents read, 245, 256 f., 302, 313; voting, 245; Apollinarian texts cited in error, 245, 282; condemnation of Nestorius, 245 f., 310, 348; sentence of deposition, 246; his protest, 248. Arrival of John of Antioch and the Easterns (June 26), 247; their council, 247; members, 247; they depose Cyril and Memnon of Ephesus, 247, 249; deposition disregarded, 248; hostility of local clergy to Easterns, 247 f., 250, 254. Imperial rescript (June 29) censures Cyril's action, 248; arrival of papal legates, 248. (Sessions of July 10, 11), they approve deposition of Nestorius, 248. (Sessions 4, 5): citation of John of Antioch, 249; John and the Easterns excommunicated but not deposed, 249; later censures of Cyril for this, 270; report to Emperor and Pope, 249; alleged condemnation of Pelagianism, 197, 249; condemnation of Messalians, 212. (Session 6, July 22): question of "Nestorian" Creed at Philadelphia, 250; Creed of Nicæa affirmed, 250, 278, 289. (Session 7), autonomy of Church of Cyprus recognized, 250. (August): arrival of John, the new imperial commissioner, 251; deposition of Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon accepted, 251; abortive conference under Count John, 251; reference to the Emperor, 252; imperial conference at Chalcedon, 253; its members, 253, 258; failure, 254; Cyrillians invited to Constantinople, 254 f., 258; dissolution of Council by Theodosius, 255; position of Memnon and Cyril, 255
Aftermath of the Council, vii., 256, 257, 265, 272; letter of Easterns from Ephesus to Theodosius, 262; new profession of faith adopted by Cyril, 262 f., 281 f.; the pacification (433), 262-65, 272, 281. Records of the Council, 244, 249, 289; history by Hesychius, 241; Evagrius on, 316; question of date of Cyril's opposition to claims of Jerusalem, 319; Council recognized in encyclical of Basiliscus, 338, and in the Henotikon of Zeno, 348 f., and by Martyrius of Jerusalem, 353; rejected in Persia, 393
Second Council, the *Latrocinium* (449), 279, 303, 331, 339; proposals for new council (August 1) and its management, 285, 287; attitude of Rome, 286; the Tome of Leo to Flavian of Constantinople, 286 f.; the papal legates, 286 f.; their ignorance of Greek, 288. (Session 1), meeting of the Council under Dioscorus of Alexandria (August 8), 287; position of legates, 288, and of Flavian, 323; the participants, 287 f., 300 f.; presence of Timothy Aelurus and Peter Mongus, 330; activities of Juvenal of Jerusalem, 287, 290 f.; policy of imperial representatives, 287, 289 f., and of Chrysaphius, 292; the question of Eutyches, 288 f.; difficulties of papal legates, 288 f.; Pope Leo's letters evaded, 288, 300; Acts of Constantinople (448) and Ephesus (431) read, 289; restoration of Eutyches, 289, 331; attack of Dioscorus on Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylæum, 289, 300; their condemnation, 290; scenes of disturbance, 290; report of Dioscorus to Theodosius II., 290 f. Session 2 (August 22), 291: absence of papal legates, 291; deposition of Ibas of Edessa, 291, 309; of Daniel of Haran, Aquilinus of Byblos, and Theodoret, 291; case of Sophronius of Tella, 291; acceptance of Cyril's Anathemas, 291, 313; position of Domnus of Antioch, 287, 290 f., 293 f.; Flavian's appeal to Pope Leo, 290, 292; action of Leo, 292 f.; the Council annulled, 292, 322, 412, 461; the *Latrocinium Ephesinum*,

Ephesus—*continued*
313; Theodosius approves the Council, 293, 412; his policy reversed by Pulcheria, 296; attitude of Empress Eudocia, 325; records of Council read at Chalcedon, 290, 300 f.; disregarded in case of Ibas, 309; Nestorius and the Council, 311 f.; attitude of Anatolius, 333; Council recognized in encyclical of Basiliscus, 338; implications of Zeno's Henotikon, 348; records of the Council, 290 f., 300
Council (476), 339
Ephrem, St (*c.* 308-73), 391
Ephtalite Turks, 378. *See* Turks
Epictetus, Bp. of Corinth (*c.* 369), 260
Epiphania, 394
Epiphanius, Bp. of Pavia (467-95), 416
Epiphanius, Bp. of Salamis (367-403): as a monk at Ad Vetus, 31; Bp. of Salamis, 30; in Cyprus, 27, 30, 31; his dislike of images, 12, 34; his *Panarion*, 27, 30; friend of Jerome and Paula, 30; caution of Jerome, 30; hatred of Origenism, 27, 30 ff., 34, 41, 59 f.; mission of Aterbius to Jerusalem, 30; Epiphanius and Palladius, 30, 34; his visit to Jerusalem (394), 31 f.; his suspicions of Bp. John, 31 f.; length of sermons, 32; disregard of etiquette at Jerusalem, 33 f., at Constantinople, 59 f.; visit to Jerome at Bethlehem, 32; and to Ad Vetus, 32 f.; Jerome takes his side, 33 f., 41, 119; forcible ordination of Paulinian, 32 f.; strained relations with John of Jerusalem, 33, 35; letter to Bp. John, 30, 34 f.; translation by Jerome, 34; correspondence with Jerome, 41 f.; Epiphanius and Rufinus, 34; and Pope Siricius, 36; varying relations with Theophilus of Alexandria, 36, 38, 41 f., 59; Epiphanius at Constantinople, 59 f.; attitude to Chrysostom, 59 f.; return to Cyprus, and death, 60; popular reverence for him, vi., 30 f.
Epiphanius, the monk (*c.* 510), 334
Epirus, 125, 432
Epitaphs, 453
Epithalamium, 111, 141, 182
Erazamoin, 369
Erez, 369
Erin, 425
Erzeroum, 365, 375
Esdras, Fourth Book of, 10
Esquiline, 452, 458
Etchmiadzin, 368 f., 375
Etheria, virgin (*saec.* iv.), her *Peregrinatio*, 10, 113; her home, 113
Ethics, Pagan and Christian, 3, 4, 419, *cf.* 146
Ethiopia, 217; St Matthew in, 397
Euchaites, monastery in Helenopontus, 343, 352
Eucharist, 77. *See* Liturgy
Eucharisticon. *See* Paulinus of Pella
Eucheria. *See* Etheria
Eucherius, Bp. of Lyons (*c.* 434-49): his secular career, 418 f.; his sons educated by Vincent of Lérins, 196; address of Cassian to, 191; asceticism, 191, 419
Eucherius, son of Stilicho, 107
Eudocia, Athenais, Empress (421-60?): pagan, daughter of Leontius the Athenian rhetor, 275; baptism, 276; married to Theodosius II. (421), 276; mother of Eudoxia, 276; proclaimed Empress (423), 276; literary studies, 276, 325; relations with Theodosius II., 276, 325; in retirement at Jerusalem, 325; attitude to Council of Chalcedon, 325; foments opposition of Gerontius in Palestine, 325-28; letter of Pope Leo to, 328; disasters to her family, 328; Peter the Iberian and, 390; joins in restoring Church "of the Apostles" at Rome, 452
Eudocia, grand-daughter of Athenais Eudocia: daughter of Valentinian III. and Eudoxia, 432, 447; captive of Genseric in Africa, 328, 432, 447; intended bride of Gaudentius, son of Aetius, 445; marries Huneric, 445
Eudoxia, Empress (395-404), wife of Arcadius: a Frank, daughter of Bauto, 49; married by Eutropius to Arcadius (395), 49; her attitude to Chrysostom, 54, 59, 61, 65; the affair of the statue, 66 f.; supposed allusions of Chrysostom to her, 61, 64, 67; her death (404), 70; mother of Theodosius II., 271
Eudoxia, Empress (422-55?), wife of Valentinian III., 276, 293; daughter of Theodosius II. and Athenais Eudocia, 276, 452; forced second marriage to Petronius Maximus (455), 446; captive of Genseric in Africa (455), 432, 447; mother of Eudocia, 432, 447; shares in restoration of Church "of the Apostles" (Church of Eudoxia) at Rome, 452
Eudoxius, Arian, Bp. of Constantinople (360-70), his burial place, 211
Eugenius, Bp. of Carthage (481-505?): his character, 437; ill-treatment by Vandals, 437 f.; relations with Huneric, 438 f., 441; conference with Cyrila (484), 439 f.; intern-

ment, 441 ; recalled by Guntamund (487), 443 ; re-opening of churches (494), 443
Eugenius, Pope (654-57), 160
Eugenius, usurping Emperor (*c.* 394), 84 f.
Eugraphia, opponent of Chrysostom, 54, 61 ; an "elderly coquette," 61
Eulalius, Bp. of Chalcedon (*c.* 430), relations with Alexander the Acoemete and Hypatius the monk, abbot of *Rufinianæ*, 214 f. ; hostile to Nestorius and to the Easterns, 254
Eulalius, Anti-Pope (418-19 : archdeacon of Zosimus, 173 ; consecrated at the Lateran, 173 ; supported by Symmachus, Prefect of Rome, 173, 451 ; intervention of the Court of Ravenna, 173 ff. ; opposition of Placidia, 175 ; his ejection, 174 ; survival of his party, 178, 453
Eulogiæ, 261
Eulogius, Bp. of Cæsarea in Palestine (*c.* 404-17 ?), 406 ; presides at Council of Diospolis (415), 154
Eulogius, tribune and notary, at the *Latrocinum* (449), 287
Eunomians, 121
Eunomius, Bp. of Cyzicus (360-64), Arian, 340
Eunuchs, 50, 147, 252, 260, 277, 293, 325, 383, 445
Euoptius, Bp. of Ptolemais (*c.* 430) : brother of Synesius, 204, 253 ; a Cyrillian, 253
Euphemia, St, martyr (307) : Church of, at Chalcedon, meeting-place of Arcadius and Gildas, 51 ; Dioscorus the Tall Brother buried there, 66 ; meeting-place of Council of Chalcedon, 299 ; sanctuary adjoining church, 306 f.
Euphrates, 379, 385, 394 : solitudes on its borders, 213 ; boundary of "diocese" of Pontus, 320 ; the two rivers and the plain of Aram, 362 ; Upper Euphrates, 363, 372 ; Lower Euphrates, Jewish colonies near, 380 ; provinces of the Empire on, 390
Euphratesiana : ecclesiastical province, 261, 265, 334, 345 ; Cyrrhos in, 253 : Samosata in, 261 ; its metropolis Hierapolis, 261, 345 ; in "diocese" of the Orient, 334
Eupraxios, official (*saec.* vi.), 316
Euprepius, monastery of, at Antioch, 220
Euric, king of the Visigoths (466-85) ; succeeds Theodoric II., 416 ; conquests in Gaul, 416 f. ; ecclesiastical policy, 417 f., 469 ; keeps bishoprics vacant in Aquitaine, 417 f. ; Sidonius Apollinaris and, 416-18, 423 ; Faustus of Riez and, 418, 420, 423 ; further conquests, 422 f. ; death, 423 ; father of Alaric II., 418
Eusebius, Bp. of Ancyra (*c.* 445), supporter of Dioscorus at *Latrocinium* (449), 301, 307 ; deposition demanded at Chalcedon, 301 f. ; views of canons on jurisdiction of Constantinople, 321
Eusebius, Bp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia (360-70), 372
Eusebius, Bp. of Cæsarea, in Palestine (*c.* 313-37) : as historian, viii. ; aids in composing *Apology for Origen*, 36, 43 ; his episcopal lists, 318 f. ; on Christians in Armenia, 366 ; on Gospel to the Hebrews, 397 ; *Life of Constantine*, 379, 381 ; History, 318, 397 ; *Præparatio*, 379
Eusebius, Bp. of Dorylæum (*c.* 448-52 ?) : a pleader, attacks Nestorius at Constantinople (*c.* 428), 228, 280 ; later Bp. of Dorylæum, 228 ; attacks Eutyches before Flavian at Constantinople (448), 280 ; his character and opinions, 280 ; himself assailed at the *Latrocinium*, 289, 291, 300 ; appeals to Pope Leo, 292 ; his successor appointed, 294 ; acts as accuser at Chalcedon, 300, 303 ; views as to the proposed Definition, 307
Eusebius, Bp. of Emesa (*c.* 341-59), 420
Eusebius, Bp. of Nicomedia (*c.* 325-42), 56
Eusebius, Bp. of Pelusium (*c.* 431-57), assailed by Isidore, 206, 332 ; ejected as a Dioscorian, 332 ; consecrates Timothy Aelurus at Alexandria, 332
Eusebius, first Bp. of Vercellæ (340-71), 128
Eusebius, a bishop in Italy (*saec.* v.), correspondent of Cyril, 185
Eusebius of Cremona, priest (*c.* 393) : friend of Jerome, 37 ; hostile to Origen, 37, 43
Eusebius, a "Tall Brother" (*c.* 401), 39, 42
Eustathius, Bp. of Berytus (*c.* 448-57) : in trial of Ibas of Edessa, 283 ; share in *Latrocinium* (449), 301 ; deposition demanded at Chalcedon, 301 f. ; question of his presence after, 302
Eustathius, Bp. of Sebaste (*c.* 357-80) : his monks, 201 ; his charity, 372
Eustathius, deacon (*c.* 414), 127
Eustochium, virgin (*c.* 370-418) : friend and companion of Jerome at Bethlehem, 133, 136, 155 f., 207 ; her charity, 136 ; letter to Pope Innocent, 156 ; death, 207

Eutherius, Bp. of Tyana (*c.* 431): deposed at Constantinople after Council of Ephesus (431), 258; hostility to Cyril, 261, 265; letter to Pope Xystus, 265; exiled, 266; attacked by Marius Mercator, 284
Euthymius, St, abbot (377-473): his monastery near Jerusalem, 294, 324; attitude to Chalcedon, 325, 327; Life by Cyril of Scythopolis, 326, 353
Euthymius, St, monk near Jericho: healing power, 396
Euthymius, a "Tall Brother" (*c.* 401), 39, 42
Eutropius, *præpositus sacri cubiculi* (*c.* 395), 203: effects marriage of Arcadius and Eudoxia (395), 49; influence and character, 50; successes against Huns, 50; made Consul and Patrician, 50; secures Chrysostom's appointment as Bp. of Constantinople, 51; intrigues with Gildo, 85; his death, 54
Eutyches (*c.* 378-453?): his early influence, 227; opposition to theology of Antioch, 227, 277, and to Nestorius, 229; partisan of Cyril, 253, 260, 277; comparison of beliefs, 281 f., 291 f.; godfather and director of Chrysaphius, 276 f.; Dioscorus of Alexandria seeks profit from this, 276 f., 279, 284; Eutyches' monastery, 277; theological views, 277 f., 280, 282, 335; attitude to the "Two Natures," 280 f., 283, 289; his wide influence, 277; attacked by Theodoret, 278; his letter to Pope Leo, 279, 284; accused before Flavian at Constantinople, 280; deposed and excommunicated, 280 f.; his "appeal," 283; action of Dioscorus, 303; letter to Peter Chrysologus of Ravenna, 284; Pope Leo's view of him, 284 f., 286, 297; attitude of Theodosius II., 285, 327, 412; Tome of Leo, 286 f.; papal legates at Ephesus with letter of condemnation, 287; policy behind the *Latrocinium*, 287 f.; rehabilitation of Eutyches there, 288 f., 300 f., 331, 412; effect of fall of Chrysaphius, 295; Eutyches in confinement, 296; supported by Hesychius, 241, 327; Council of Chalcedon and Eutyches, 300 ff., 304 f., 308, 316, 323; Leo's condemnation of him accepted there, 302, 308, 316, 322, 412; Egyptian bishops and Eutyches, 304 f.; refusal of monks to condemn him, 305 f.; Nestorius and Eutyches, 311, 317, 393; Amphilochius of Side and Eutyches, 335; Palestinian monks and the condemnation, 324; Eutyches in exile, 326 f.; Pope Leo and the exile, 327; opponents of Chalcedon as disciples of Eutyches, 330, 457; position in Egypt, 330 f.; Timothy Aelurus and, 330, 336, 339 f.; Eutyches' views censured in Encyclical of Basiliscus, 338; and in Henotikon of Zeno, 349; position in Syria, 340 f.; view of Eutyches at Rome, 457; monastic disturbances caused by his case, 24; its effect on reputation of monasticism, 25; effect of conflict in East and West, 460
Eutychians, 327; "Eutychian" as label, viii.; Pope Leo's definition, 335; Eutychians at Constantinople, 333, 339; their opposition to Timothy Aelurus, 339; his attitude to them in Egypt, 340
Eutychianus, Spaniard (*c.* 437), 436
Euxinus, Pontus, 336, 360, 362. *See* Black Sea
Evagrius, Bp. at Antioch (*c.* 389-92): head of the "Little Church," 207; his followers, 207
Evagrius, monk (*c.* 345-99): native of Pontus, 28; his career, 28 f.; master of asceticism, 29, 151; attitude to Origen, *ibid.*; writings, 29, 46; Jerome's view of him, 151; his death, (399), 39
Evagrius, historian (*saec.* vi.), 220, 324, 343 f., 347, 350: as historian, viii.; his personal history, 316; on monument of Simeon Stylites, 218; on Dioscorus of Alexandria, 294; on Church of St Euphemia at Chalcedon, 299; account of Council of Chalcedon, 301, 306, 310, 316; on Alexandrian affairs, 331, 334 f., 337; on the *Apology* of Nestorius, 311; on the Anti-encyclical of Basiliscus, 345; and the Henotikon, 348; on Roman Council (484) and deposition of Acacius, 355; on African confessors at Constantinople, 442
Use of Zacharias of Gaza, 316, 334, 339, 358; his authorities, 316, 329, 331, 335, 339, 355; quoted, 236 339
Evodius, Bp. of Uzala (*c.* 401-26), 193
Exarch, 320
Excommunication: by Theophilus of Alexandria without trial, 39; of Apiarius, 169, 179; of Julian of Eclanum, 183; sentences by Nestorius annulled by Pope Celestine, 234; of papal legates by Roman Synod (484), 355; of Acacius of Constantinople (484), 356; of the advocate Tutus, 359; position of persons excommunicated, 41, 58, 68, 149, 170, 258, 281, 356, 414; partial

excommunication, 249; of laity, 68, 278, 414
Exegesis. *See* Bible
Exile. *See* Civil Power
Exokionion, Exokionitai, 202, 458, *cf.* 53
Exorcists, 16
Exploration, 397
Exposure, 438
Exuperius, Bp. of Toulouse (*c.* 405-11), 21, 117 f.

Fabiola, Roman matron († 399), 131 f.
Fabius, Italian bishop (*saec.* v.), 229
Fabius Maximus, Q. (*saec.* iv. B.C.), 132
Fabricius, Caius (*saec.* iii. B.C.), 139
Facundus, Bp. of Hermiana in Byzacena (*c.* 546-71): his *Defensio Trium Capitulorum*, 74, 268, 270, 278, 301 f.
Fall, The: views of Augustine, 143 ff.; of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 146; of Pelagius, 143 f., 146, 148, 154, 422; of Celestius, 148 f.; of Faustus of Riez, 422; of Bossuet, 145; modern Catholic doctrine, 145, 149
Famine, 108, 138, 443
Fasti Consulares, 105
Fastidius, British bishop (*saec.* v.), 188, 425; the *De Vita Christiana*, 188
Fatalis, friend of Fastidius (*saec.* v.), 188
Fathers, Appeal to, 199, 231, 245, 254, 278, 282, 302, 335, 439
Faustinus, Bp. of Potentia in Picenum (*c.* 418): legate of Pope Zosimus to Carthage, 170, 175 f.; and of Pope Celestine, 178 f.
Faustus, Armenian bishop (*c.* 373), 374 f.
Faustus, Bp. of Riez (*c.* 400-85 ?): a Briton, 420, 423; abbot of Lérins (*c.* 455), 25, 420; character and abilities, 420; admired by Sidonius Apollinaris, 420; attacked by Prosper of Aquitaine, 198; attitude to Pelagianism, 266, 421 f.; on *The Grace of God and Free Will*, 421 f.; exiled by Euric, 418, 422 f.; restored, 423
Faustus, an Armenian (*saec.* iv.), 374
Faustus of Byzantium (*saec.* iv.), History of Armenian Church, 367, 373 ff.
Faustus, Manichean bishop (*c.* 383), 421, 454
Faustus, Consul, his date, 457
Faustus, Basilica of, 435
Felix I., Pope (*c.* 269-74), Apollinarian writings wrongly attributed to, 231, 245, 282
Felix III., Pope (483-92): his father's work, 468; succeeds Simplicius, 354, 469; effort to settle Alexandrian affairs, 354 f.; falling away of his legates imprisoned at Constantinople, 355; their deposition, 355; he deposes Acacius of Constantinople, 356 f.; breach with Greek Church, 357, 469; his aims, 357, 469
Felix, Bp. of Aptunga (*c.* 311-13), 98 f.
Felix, Bp. of Como (*saec.* iv.), 128
Felix, Bp. of Nocera (*c.* 402), 21
Felix, Bp. of Trèves (*c.* 385-99), 118
Felix, priest of Nola (*saec.* iii.), 114 ff.
Felix, Roman priest (*saec.* v.), father of Pope Felix III., repairs Basilica of St Paul, 468
Felix, *Magister Militum*, in Gaul (*c.* 426), 407
Felix, Manichean (*saec.* v.), 454
Felix, rival of Aetius (*c.* 430), 401
Felix, Roman "defensor" (*c.* 483), 355
Ferrandus, Fulgentius (*saec* vi.), 86
Festivals and Fasts: Christmas, 8, 68, 257; Epiphany, 8, 173; Lent, 100, 174, 216; Holy Thursday, 161, 332; Good Friday, 174, 383; Holy Saturday, 7 f., 68, 174; Easter, 8, 68, 132, 161, 174, 283, 428; Pentecost, 7 f., 69; Ascension, 439; Ember seasons, 7
of saints and martyrs, 8, 11; St Peter and St Paul, 459; St Peter's Chair, 293; of the Elders of the Apocalypse, 10; of the Four Living Creatures, 10
Dedication, 153, 381, 420
Fiesole, 106
Finns, 401
Fire-worshippers, 358
Firmus, Bp. of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia (*c.* 431-39), 238, 253
Firmus, son of Nubel the Moorish Chief (*c.* 372): murders his brother, 80; revolts from Empire, 80; attacked by his brother Gildo, 82; and by Theodosius, 81; hangs himself, 81, 85
Flaccilla, Empress (376-85): wife of Theodosius I., mother of Arcadius, 49
Flaccilla, daughter of Arcadius (born 397), 201
Flanders, 117
Flavia Cæsariensis, 423
Flavian, Bp. of Antioch (381-404): Chrysostom under, 52; his great age, 52, 67, 70; death, 70
Flavian, Bp. of Constantinople (446-49): successor of Proclus, 275; doctrinal sympathies, 275; his views and those of Cyril of Alexandria, vi., 281; disliked by Dioscorus, 275; opposed by monks, 216; tries Eutyches at Constantinople (448), 280, 282 ff., 288 f., 301, 349; allegation of unfairness, 285; letter to Pope Leo, 284; Theodosius II. exacts a confession of faith, 285; Tome of Leo (*q.v.*), 241, 286, 295,

302, 312, 330, 412, 461 ; at the *Latrocinium* (449), 287 ; his precedence there, 287, 323 ; proposals for deposition, 288 f., 300 f., 303, 339 ; ill-treatment, 290, 293 ; appeal to Leo, 290, 292 ff., 412 ; escape, 290 f. ; deposition approved by Emperor, 293 ; decree revoked, 324 ; death, 293, 311 ; alleged murder, 293 f. ; successor elected, 294 ; burial at Constantinople, 296 ; Nestorius and Flavian, 311 f., 314, 393 ; Flavian rehabilitated at Chalcedon, 301, 322
Flavian, Bp. of Philippi (*c.* 431) : letter of Pope Celestine to, 235 ; at Council of Ephesus (431), 242 ; Cyrillian, 253 ; at Constantinople, 254, 258
Fleet, 61, 65, 109, 446 f.
Flesh, Resurrection of, 36, *cf.* 204
Florence, 106
Florentius, Patrician (*c.* 448), 280, 283
Florus, Italian bishop (*saec.* v.), 186, 229
Fonts, 7, 16, 68, 443
Forgery, 199, 228, 231 f., 245, 282, 350, 368
Fortunatus, Manichean (*saec.* v.), 454
Fossores, 16
France, 430. *See* Franks
Francis, St (1182-1226), 116
Franks : beyond the Rhine, 105 ; their advance to Cologne and Tongres southwards, 105, 403 ; swept aside by others, 106 ; command of frontier, 105, 112 ; further advances (*saec.* v.), 402 ; checked by Aetius, 402 ; rampant in N. Gaul, 403, 415 ; Cologne, capital of a Frankish kingdom, 403 ; wandering bands in Armorica, 414. *See* Bauto, Eudoxia
Free Will : infant baptism and question of, 149, *cf.* 157 ; views of Augustine, 143, 168, 192 f., 200 ; of Cassian, 193, 422 ; of Faustus of Riez, 421 f. ; of Leo, 199 f., 457 ; of Pelagius, 143 f., 163 f., 422
Fréjus, diocese of : relations with Lérins, 25, 190 f., 420. *See* Leontius, Theodore
Frequentum, 182
Frigento, 182
Frigidus, Battle of the (394), victory of Theodosius, 105, 361
Frontiers : of Eastern Empire, 360 f., and Persia, 202, 365, 375, 380, 384, 386, 388, 390 ; Arab tribes on, 388, 394 f.
of Western Empire broken (*saec.* v.), 104 ; barbarian settlers on, 104 f. ; advances on the Rhine, 105, 112 ; invasions of Italy, 106, 108, 450, 467 ; in Gaul, 416, 422 ; in Britain, 423 ; in Egypt, 400 ; Africa, 133, 205, 438
on Danube, 134, 202
Frumarius, King of the Suevi (*c.* 461), 406
Frumentius, Bp. of Auxume (*c.* 368) ; mission of, 397 f., 400
Fulgentius Ferrandus (*saec.* vi.), 86
Funerals, 373
Fussala, 176 ff., 235. *See* Antony

GABALA. *See* Severian
Gabalum, 417
Gabriel, Archangel, cultus of, 10
Gades, 194
Gaiane, martyr (*saecc.* iii.-iv.), 368
Gainas, the Gothic (*c.* 399-400), 203 ; commander of imperial forces in Asia, 50, 105 ; intrigues with Stilicho against Eutropius, 50 ; revolt and temporary success, 51 ; slain by Huns in Thrace, 51 ; relations with Chrysostom, 54
Galata, 328
Galatia Secunda, 334. *See* Ajax, Palladius
Galerius, Emp. (306-11) : victory (297), 364 ; persecutor, 440 ; death, 443
Galicia : Priscillianists in, 112, 404 f. ; Etheria's convent in, 113 ; the Suevi in, 402, 406 ; state of the Church in, 404 f. ; Britons in, 423
Galla, Empress (*c.* 386-94), sister of Valentinian II. : second wife of Theodosius I., 49
Galla Placidia, Empress (425-50) : daughter of Theodosius I., 49 ; sister of Arcadius and Honorius, 49, 109, 166 ; prisoner of Alaric (410), 109 ; marriage to Athaulf the Goth (414), 110 f. ; marriage to Constantius (417), 111, 160 ; their relations, 175 ; attitude to Pelagianism, 166 ; supports Bonifacians in papal struggle, 173, 175 ; her letters, 175 ; in retirement at Constantinople (423), 187 ; mother of Honoria and of Valentinian III., 187 ; returns to Ravenna (425), 187, 401 ; ruler for Valentinian III., 401, 405, 445 ; court intrigues, 401, 405 ; relations with Count Boniface, 194, 401, 431 ; under influence of Aetius (432), 401 ; decree against Pelagians, 187 ; relations with Augustine, 194 ; supports Pope Leo after the *Latrocinium* (449), 293, 467 ; grandmother of Placidia the younger, 432, 446 ; death (450), 445 ; Palace of, 61
Gallas, African tribe, 396
Galloway, 427
Gangra in Paphlagonia : Council (*saec.* iv., med.), 19, 387 ; Dioscorus in exile at, 298, 329 f. ; Timothy Aelurus in exile at, 336
Garamæa, 381, 386
Gargilius, Baths of, at Carthage, 95 f.
Garin, 365

Garhni, 364
Gaudentius, Bp. of Brescia (*saec.* iv.), pupil and successor of Philastrius, 128 ; preacher, 128 f.
Gaudentius, Bp. of Novara (397-417), 128
Gaudentius, Donatist, Bp. of Thamugad (*c.* 411-20) : at the Conference at Carthage (411), 96, 102 ; exhibition of fanaticism later, 102
Gaudentius, son of Aetius (*saec.* v.) : destined by his father as husband for Eudocia, daughter of Valentinian III., 445 ; prisoner of the Vandals, 447
Gaul : early invasion of Rome from, 108 ; ecclesiastical organization, 19, 161 f., 407, 465 ; civil organization, 19, 168, 187, 406 f., 453, 465 f. ; procedure in ecclesiastical disputes, 20 ; monastic influence in, 24 f., 190 f., 418 ff. (*see also* Lérins) ; relics of Priscillianist struggle, 112 ; influence of St Martin, 112, 116 f. ; of Paulinus of Nola, 115 ; Sulpicius Severus on condition of, 116 ff. ; schism as to Felix of Trèves, 118 ; career of Vigilantius in, 118 ff. ; celibacy in, 120 ; "Bonosiaci" in, 123 ; Franks, 105, 403 ; Alamanni and Burgundians, 105 ; Suevi, Alans, and Vandals (406), 106 f., 109, 138 f., 430 f. ; usurpation of Constantine III. at Arles, 107, 109 f., 117, 423 ; Goths in (412), 99, 110 ; Paulinus of Pella on the barbarians, 138 ; Salvian of Marseilles on them, 139, 419 ; Pelagian tendencies in, 141 ; career of Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, 110, 117, 156, 162 ; attitude of Pope Zosimus in ecclesiastical affairs, 161 f., 172, 407, 464 ; Emp. Honorius and the Gallic bishops, 174 ; Placidia and (425), 187 f. ; influence of Germanus of Auxerre, 188 f., 412 f., 425 ; and of Lupus of Troyes, 188 f., 413 ; relations of Britain and Gaul, 188 f., 424 f. ; Pope Celestine and, 188, 196 f., 409 ; reputation of Simeon Stylites in, 217 ; Ste Geneviève, *q.v.* ; heresy of Leporius, 230 ; barbarian domination in, 358, 401, 422, 447 f. ; Aetius and the barbarians, 402 f., 432 ; mission of Leo, 467 ; effect of barbarians on ecclesiastical organization, 403, 417 ; developments under Patroclus of Arles, 160 ff., 407 ff., and his successors, 407 ff. ; Pope Leo and Hilary of Arles, 409 ff. ; Leo and Ravennius, 411 f. ; invasion of Attila (451), 413 ; Councils (*q.v.*), 414, 421 ; *Libri Canonum*, 21 ; imperial pretenders in, 415 ; proclamation of Avitus, 415, 447 ; progress of Goths and Burgundians, 415 f., 447 f., 450 ; career of Sidonius Apollinaris, 415-18 ; of Faustus of Riez, 420-23 ; proclamation of Julius Nepos, 449 ; Manicheans in, 455
Gaza : Peter of Iberia at (438), 325 f. ; Hilarion († 371) at, 395. *See* Æneas, Zacharias
Gelasius, Pope (492-96) : Decretal Letters, 21 ; on the Bonosiaci, 123 ; *De duabus Naturis*, 254 ; *Gesta de Nomine Acacii*, 294, 317, 342, 346, 354 ; on Nestorius, 312 ; suppresses Lupercalia, 451 ; and Manicheans, 456 ; on Pelagianism, 457 ; on unity of the Roman Church, 458
Geminian, Bp. (*c.* 458), papal legate, 335
Genesis, 62, 65, 362
Genethlius, Bp. of Carthage (374-91), his Councils, 82, 87
Genethlius, Count of the Privy Treasury, present at Chalcedon (451), 299
Geneva, 412
Geneviève of Nanterre, St (*c.* 423-512), 217, 413
Gennadius, Bp. of Constantinople (458-71) : succeeds Anatolius, 336 ; his views, 336, 338, 342 ; aids Martyrius of Antioch, 342 ; ordains Daniel the Stylite, 344 ; death, 338
Gennadius, priest of Marseilles († 496) : *De Viris Illustribus*, 123, 127, 188, 190, 405 ; *De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus*, 123 ; on Fastidius, 188 ; on Cassian, 190 ; on death of Theodoret, 341
Genoa, 196
Genseric, king (*c.* 428-77) of the Vandals : established in Baetica, 194 ; invades Africa (*c.* 429), 194, 431 ; siege of Hippo (430), 195, 431 ; takes Carthage (439), 432 ; his conquests in Africa, 432, 434 ; piracy, 432, 446 f. ; treatment of Church of Carthage, 433, 435 ; invades Sicily (440), 122 ; persecution there, 122 ; persecution in Africa, 433, 435 ff., 438 ; attempted proselytism, 436 ; his troops pillage Rome (455), 415, 432, 446 f. ; imperial captives, 328, 432, 447 ; relations with Pope Leo, 446, 467 ; supports pretensions of Olybrius (473), 449 ; death, 437
Genzon, son of Genseric (*saec.* v.) : his domains, 434 ; his sons, 438, 443
Geography, knowledge of, 397, 399, 465
George, Anti-Pope of Alexandria (*c.* 356-61), 56
George, the monk in Cappadocia (*saec.* v.), 328

Georgia, 361, 371
Gerasimus, St, monk († 475), 325
Germa, 221. *See* Antony
German, Germans: language, 415; peoples, 106, 112, 120, 450; in Dacia, 127; on the Danube, 120, 449; supremacy of Huns over, 401; relations with the Empire, 104, 112; auxiliaries in army, 104, 108, 450; attitude of Romans to, 108; Germanic barbarism, 127, 337; effect on Latin Church, 347; invasion of Britain, 423. *See also* Goths
Germanicia, 390. *See* John
Germanus, St, Bp. of Auxerre (418-48): formerly a secular official, 404; character, 188, 404, 413; sent by Pope Celestine to Britain against Pelagians, 188 f., 425; relations with Hilary of Arles, 410, 412; visit to Ravenna and death, 412; burial at Auxerre, 413
Gerontius, Archimandrite (*c.* 461), prosecutes Lampetius, 213
Gerontius, priest (*saec.* v.): Life of Melania the Younger, 133; monk and almoner of Melania, 325, 353; succeeds her, 325; relations with Peter of Iberia, 325, 390; attitude to Chalcedon, 325, 353
Gerontius, general of Constantine III. (*saec.* v.), 109; revolts, 109 f.; flees to Spain, 110
Getae, 106
Gibraltar, 194
Gildas, historian (*saec.* vi.): *De Excidio Britanniae*, 424 f., 430; his omissions, 424 f.; on Saxon invasion, 430
Gildo, son of Nubel: supremacy in Africa (387-99?), 82; relations with Donatists, 82, 88 f.; revolt and death, 85, 89
Glycerius, Emperor (473), 449; consecrated bishop, 449
Gnosticism, Christian, 13
Gnostics, 193
Godfather, 39, 276, 442
Golden Horn, 61, 338
Gomon, 214
Gondebaud, Burgundian king (*c.* 470-516): succeeds to part of Euric's power, 418; letter of Avitus of Vienne to, 421; nominated Patrician by Olybrius, 449; succeeds to power of Ricimer, 449; share in proclamation of Glycerius, 449
Gonderic, king of the Vandals (*saec.* v.): power in Andalusia, 430; brother of Genseric, 431
Gorioun (*saec.* v.): "Life of St Mesrob," 376
Gorneae, 364
Gortyna, 125
Gospel, Hebrew, 397
Gospel, reading of, 399; versified, 114
Gospels, Book of the, 210
Gothic language, 54
Goths: early home, 360; Armenian fables, 368; relations with Empire, 50, 105 f., 110 f., 121, 447; missions to, 54, 70, 121, 360; Catholics among them, 53 f.; Arian influences, 53, 120 f., 123; bishops of, 120 ff., 194; settlements in Crimea, 54, 360; campaigns of Theodosius in Balkans (*saec.* iv.), 125; settlements in Illyricum, 50 (*cf.* 73), 105 f., 134; in Danube provinces, 120; in Thrace, 120; in Asia Minor and Phrygia, 50; in conflict with Huns (400), 51
in Africa under Sigisvult (427), 121 f., 194, 431
at Constantinople, 50 f.; overthrow Rufinus (395), 50; relations of Chrysostom with, 53 f., 70. *See also* Gainas
in Gaul (412), 99, 110 f.; successes of Constantius against them, 111, 160; established at Toulouse (419), 402; used by Aetius against Suevi and Bagaudæ, 403; and against Attila (451), 403, 413; menace to Aquitaine, 414 f.; secure proclamation of Avitus as Emperor (455), 415, 447; capture Narbonne (462), 415; masters of Auvergne, 416; treatment of Church in Aquitaine (475), 417; in possession of Arles (477), 422, 450. *See also* Athaulf, Euric
in Italy: introduced as auxiliaries by Theodosius, 50; invasion (401), 106, 134; battle of Pollentia (402), 73, 106, 134; capture of Rome by Alaric (410), 108 f., 135; Athaulf in Italy (411), 110; S. Agata dei Goti at Rome, 458. *See also* Alaric, Ricimer, Theodoric
in Spain (414), 111 f., 402, 406, 450
Grace: views of Augustine and Pelagius compared, 143 ff.; opposition of ascetics to Augustine's views, 146, 150 f.; Pelagius and the "aid of God," 153; Council of Diospolis (415), 154; appeal by Church of Carthage to Pope Innocent, 157; his views, 157 f.; Council of Carthage (418), 166; writings of Augustine, 168, 193 f.; attitude of Julian of Eclanum, 184; Prosper and the "ingrates," 195; views of Leo, 199 f., 457 f.; of Faustus of Riez (473-74), 421 f.; "Dialogue of Arnobius and Serapion," 458
Grammarians, 430. *See* Cresconius
Gratian, Emperor (375-83), 120; struggle with barbarians on the Rhine, 105;

in Illyrian provinces, 125; appeal of Roman Council (378) and rescript to Aquilinus, 130, 411, 466
Gratus, Bp. of Carthage (343-53): at Council of Sardica (343), 78 f., 172; his Council (348), 87, 172; its canons, 79, 172
Greece: Muses of Helicon removed by Constantine, 69; Athens and Corinth ravaged by Alaric, 105; a province of Illyricum, 106.
Greek, 384: civilization v., 2; philosophy and thought, 13; its influence in theology, 13, and in exegesis, 380; theology of Greek Syria, 393, and Illyricum, 465; commerce, 360, 385
Language: its subtlety, 230, 461; in Eastern Empire, 460; not official there (451), 308; in Macedonia, 125; little known in Mesopotamian Syria, 287; Syrian accent of Severian of Gabala, 54; inscription of Aizan, Prince of Axoum, 398; as dividing East and West, 460; difficulties to Popes, 461, 465 (but *see* 297); known by Pelagius, 145, 149; and Celestius, 149; and Julian of Eclanum, 183; and Julian of Cos, 297; and Emp. Marcian, 308 f.; not by Orosius, 153; nor by Leo's legates at *Latrocinium*, 288
Books translated in Persian Armenia, 268, 376; the name "Armenian," 363; and "Catholicos," 371; teachers in Armenia, 373, 376. *See* Hellenism
Episcopate: bishops supporting Chrysostom, 72, 135; theological variations (*saec.* v.), 345, 349; Pope Leo and, 322; Pope Felix III. and, 469; system of Patriarchates, 464; relation to Alexandria, 460
Parentage of Pope Zosimus, 159 f.
Gregory the Great, Pope (590-604): Donatists in Numidia in his time, 103; on the Bonosiaci, 123; on African confessors, 442; note of Arian Church in Rome, 458
Gregory, Anti-Pope of Alexandria (340), 56
Gregory, Bp. of Antioch (569-94), 316
Gregory the Illuminator, Bp. of Armenia (*c.* 302): an Armenian educated in Cappadocia, 367; consecrated at Cæsarea, 368, 373; legendary history, 368 f.; origin of Armenian Christianity, 370 f.; his family and successors, 371 f., 375 f.; and Daniel the Syrian, 372
Gregory Nazianzen, Bp. of Constantinople (381): election opposed by Pope Damasus, 126; ordains Evagrius a Nitrian monk, 28; his attitude to Origen, 28 f.; "Cappadocian" Christology, 224, 227; on the *Theotokos*, 227; homilies translated by Rufinus, 46
Gregory, Bp. of Nyssa (372-95): attitude to Origen, 28; "Cappadocian" Christology, 224
Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bp. of Neocæsarea in Pontus (*c.* 233-70): Apollinarian writings attributed to, 231, 282
Gregory, Bp. of Tours (*c.* 573-94), writings, 117, 418
Grenoble, 412
Grunnius, 46, 151
Gubbio, 21. *See* Decentius
Guelma, 91
Gundesapour, Gundisapor, 381, 386
Guntamund, king of the Vandals (484-96), son of Genzon, 443

Habakkuk, prophet, tomb of, 10
Habetdeum, Bp. (*c.* 484), 441
Hadrian, Emp. (117-137): Bridge of, at Rome, 106; wall of, in Britain, 423, 427
Hadrumetum in Byzacena: Council (394), 88; monks, 193. *See* Primasius
Haidra, 85
Hair: of barbarians and Romans, 438
Halmyrissos in Thrace: monastery of, 215
Hamath, 394
Hannibal, 364, 469
Haran, 291. *See* Daniel
Harpocration, deacon of Alexandria (*c.* 449), 293
Hatra, 394
Hayk, 363
Healing, through prayer, 361
Hearers, among Manicheans, 454, 456
Hebdomon, 59
Hebrew: Bible, 152; Gospel, 397
Hedjaz, 396
Helena, mother of Izates of Adiabene, tomb at Jerusalem, 380
Helenopolis, 51. *See* Palladius
Helenopontus, 343
Helicon, 69
Heliodorus, Bp. of Altinum (*c.* 400), friend of Jerome, 132
Helladius, solitary (*c.* 423): friend of Cassian, 191; later a bishop, 191
Helladius, Bp. of Tarsus (*c.* 430): character, 258; friend of Nestorius, 238, 258; letter of Cyril to, 238; position after Council of Ephesus (431), 258, 261; letter to Pope Xystus, 265
Hellenism: dislike of Copts for, 30; in Asia, 364, 385. *See* Greek
Hellespont, 221

Helpidius, Bp. of Laodicea (*c.* 394-414), 207, *cf.* 67
Helpidius, Count: imperial representative at Ephesus (449), 287, 289
Helpidius, Arian: correspondent of Augustine, 121 f.
Helvidius (*c.* 383), 123
Hemimont, 334
Henotikon, the: Zeno and Acacius, 348; doctrinal character, 348 f.; Monophysite view of, 349 f.; reception at Alexandria, 349 ff.; at Antioch, 351 ff.; at Rome, 355; in Armenia, 391; in Persia, 392
Heracles, 203, 369
Heraclian, Count of Africa (409-13): murderer of Stilicho, 99; harshness to Roman fugitives, 140; invasion of Italy, 99; defeat and death, 99
Heraclidas, Bp. of Nyssa (*c.* 430), 212
Heraclides, Bp. of Ephesus (401-4): installed by Chrysostom, 62; attacked at "The Oak," 62
Heraclides of Damascus, 221, 311
Heredity, 144, 149, *cf.* 186
Heremius, Bp. of Thessalonica (*c.* 359), 126
Heresies: Theodosius I. and, 222; collected by Epiphanius, 27; by Philastrius, 128; Sidonius Apollinaris on, 417; Pope Gelasius on, 457
Heretics: legislation against, 222, 440, 466; reconciliation of, 20; monks and, 23; Nestorius and, 220; in East and West, 212; at Constantinople, 202, 220 f.; at Rome, 453, 458; in Lydia, 250
Hermitages, 23, 34 f., 215
Hermopolis Parva, 39, 59. *See* Dioscorus
Herod Agrippa I. (B.C. 10-A.D. 44), 443
Herodias, 67
Heros, Bp. of Arles (*c.* 411-17): disciple of St Martin, 117; supports Constantine III., 117; ordains him priest, 110; exiled, 117, 154, 160; succeeded by Patroclus, 160; opposes Pelagius in Palestine (415), 154 f., 162; letter to Africa, 156 f.; forwarded to Pope Innocent, 157; attitude of Zosimus to, 162 ff.
Herulians, 406
Hesychius, Bp. of Salona (405-29 ?): Decretal Letter of Pope Zosimus to (418), 21, 125
Hesychius, priest of Jerusalem (fl. *c.* 412-38): as historian, viii.; history of Council of Ephesus, 241; friend of Eutyches, 241, 327; opposition to Chalcedon, 326
Hiba. *See* Ibas
Hibernia, 425. *See* Ireland
Hierapolis in Euphratesiana: massacre at, 345; ejection of bishop as "Chalcedonian," 353. *See* Alexander
Hierax, schoolmaster at Alexandria (*saec.* v.), 209
Hilarion, ascetic at Gaza († 371), 395
Hilary, Pope (461-68), 458; deacon of Pope Leo, legate at *Latrocinium* (449), 287 f., 292, 468; "Contradicitur," 289; report to Pope Leo, 292, 294; succeeds Leo, 468; his Decretal Letter, 21; founds monastery at Rome, 26; relations with Gaul, 422; with Anthemius (467), 458; annuls decision of Spanish Council (465), 466; succeeded by Simplicius, 422, 469
Hilary, Bp. of Arles (428-49): pupil, kinsman, and successor of Honoratus, 191, 407; his reputation, 407 f.; jurisdiction and administration, *ibid.*; relations with Augustine, 194; with Leo (445), 409-12; the affair of Besançon, 409 f.; friendship with Germanus of Auxerre, 410, 412
Hilary, Bp. of Narbonne (*c.* 417), 161
Hilary, Bp. of Poitiers (353-68): style, 113; controversy with Auxentius at Milan (364), 128; cited by Pelagius, 152
Hilary, monk of Marseilles: correspondence with Augustine on Pelagianism [150], 194; extreme Augustinian, 195; Pope Celestine and, 196, 409
Hilary, priest: correspondence with Augustine on Pelagianism at Syracuse, 150
Hilderic, son of Huneric, king of Vandals: recalls Catholic bishops to Africa (494), 443
Himeria, in Osrhoene, 353. *See* Uranius
Himerius, Bp. of Nicomedia (*c.* 431): opponent of Cyril, 253, 261; deposed, 258
Himerius, Bp. of Tarragona (*saec.* iv.): Decretal Letter of Pope Siricius to, 21
Himyar, 396
Hindustan, 399
Hippo, 157, 176, 190; Donatist Bp. of, 81, 459; Council (393), 85; Bishop Maximin at (427), 121; Pinianus and Melania at, 141 f.; Pelagius at (410), 147; Orosius at, 151; Timasius and James at, 152; siege of (430), 195, 431
Bishops: Valerius (*c.* 395), 86; Augustine (395-430), *q.v.*
Hippodrome, 53, 337
Hira, Hirta, 394
Historia Miscellanea, 334, 339
Hittites, 363
Holland, 402
Holophernes, 434
Holy Places, 11, 33, 150, 168, 369, 375, 394, 406, 453

Holy Spirit, 78, 89, 179
Homer, kingdom of, 396 f.
Homerites, 399
Homoiousians, 79, 122
Homoiousios, 266
Homoousians, 122, 438, 440
Homoousios, 313, 438
Honoratus, Bp. of Arles (426-8): noble and monk, 190; in the Peloponnese, 190; establishes monastery at Lérins, 190 f., 407; bishop, 191, 407, 420; his jurisdiction, 407, 409; relations with Cassian, 191; with Hilary, 191, 407; with Pope Celestine, 409
Honoratus, Bp. of Thiabe in Numidia (*c.* 428), 195
Honoratus, Antoninus. *See* Antoninus
Honoria, daughter of Constantius and Galla Placidia, 187
Honorias, province of Pontus, 334
Honorius, son of Theodosius I., Emperor (395-423): Emperor of the West, 49, 117; government established at Milan, 49; transferred to Ravenna (404), 129, 401; influence of Stilicho, 49, 73; marries Stilicho's daughters, 107; orders his death (408), 107; relations with Eastern Empire, 73; attitude to Chrysostom, 72; relations with Pope Innocent, 72, 138; attitude to Donatists in Africa, 89, 95, 99; revolt of Heraclian (412), 99; revolt of Britain (409), 107, 109, 423, and of Gaul (409), 107; invasions of Italy by Alaric, 104, 106, 108, 201; dislike of barbarians in Italy, 447; capture of his sister Placidia by them, 109; her relations with him, 166, 187; failure of Constantine III. in Gaul (411), 110, 117; relations with Constantius, 110 f., 160; relations with Athaulf the Goth, 110 f.; triumph at Rome (417), 111; attitude to Pelagians, 166, 184; the Goths in Aquitaine (419), 402; proclaims Constantius Augustus (421), 175; death, 178, 187
Hormisdas, Pope (514-23), 456, 464
Hospitals, 132, 372 f.
Hostages, 325
Hours, 5, 7, 114
Hripsime, martyr (*saecc.* iii.-iv.), 368
Huneric, son of Genseric, king of the Vandals (477-84): husband of Eudocia, 445; treatment of Catholics in Africa, 434, 437-41, 469; of Manicheans, 437 f., 456; personal character, 437 f.; persecution (483), 438-41; dies the death of the persecutors (484), 443; his family, 443; details of persecution, 444
Huns: crossing Caucasus and Danube, 50; invasion of Cappadocia and Syria, 34, 50; and Thrace, 50; threaten Palestine, 34, 50, 132; defeat Goths on Danube (400), 51; established in Pannonia, 401, 413; supremacy over other barbarians, 401; invade Gaul under Attila (451), 413; and Italy (452), 413 f.; quarrels after his death, 414
Hydatius, Bp. of Aquæ Flaviæ (427-70?), 436: his personal history, 405 f.; his *Chronicle*, viii., 405 f. (to 468 A.D.), 431; on Maximin and Genseric in Sicily, 122; on Eudoxia and Genseric, 446; on Priscillianists, 404 f.; on Spanish adhesions to Tome of Leo, 412; on invasion of Gaul by Attila, 413; on Manicheans in Spain, 456
Hyères, 24, 191
Hymns, 113, 264
Hypanis, 360
Hypata, 250. *See* Pausianus
Hypatia, of Alexandria († 415): Neoplatonist, 203, 210; teacher of Synesius, 203 ff.; murder of (415), 205, 210
Hypatius, Abbot of Rufinianæ (431); Phrygian monk from Thrace, 215; establishes monastery at Rufinianæ, 215; quarrels with Bp. of Chalcedon, 215 f.; opposition to Nestorius and his supporters, 216, 254
Hypepe, 294
Hypostasis: meaning of term, 223 ff.; Antiochene view of "two hypostases" in Christ, 223, 225; view of the "Cappadocians," 224; view of the West, 224 f.; of Cyril, 281; of the School of Edessa, 393; the "Hypostatic Union," 224 f., 393; the Definition of Chalcedon, 307; the "Three Hypostases" in the Godhead, 266
Hyrcania, 381

Ibas, Bp. of Edessa (435-57): head of the School of the Persians, 273, 390; its character, 391 f.; becomes Bp. of Edessa, 273, 392; theological views and works, 273, 340, 390; dislike of Cyril, 273, 309; disliked by Eutyches, 277; difficulties fomented by Uranius of Himeria, 277, 279, 283; issue of trial at Tyre (449), 283, 309; attacked by Marius Mercator, 284; new civil trial, 285; in prison, 286 f., 392; deposition at *Latrocinium*, 291, 309, 348; successor appointed, 294, 392; restoration at Chalcedon, 309; referred to in Henotikon, 348; letters to Maris, 273, 309

Iberia: origin of Christianity in, 361; part of Roman Empire, 364; revolt (481-82), 378; its bishops condemn Tome of Leo and Council of Chalcedon (491), 391. *See* Peter
Ibis, Oasis of: Nestorius at, 267, 272, 310, 343; Peter of Iberia at, 343
Iconium, 212
Idols, 11, 427
Idumæa, 267
Illuminations, 65, 271
Illus the Isaurian: sent against Zeno (476), 344; joins him, 345, 347; Patrician, 347; relations of John Talaia with (482), 347 f.; at variance with Zeno, 348; sent to the East, 351; proclaims Leontius Emperor, 351; takes refuge at Papyrion, 352; result of his fall, 352 f.
Illyria, Illyricum: Stilicho and, 50, 73, 106; including Dacia, Macedonia, and Greece, 106, 125; variations of language, 125, 465; and of ecclesiastical attachments, 125, 465; Alaric in, 50, 73, 105 ff., 134; Photinians in, 122; Council of Capua (391), and its bishops, 123; references to Popes from, 126 f.; papal claims over, 124 f., 161, 212, 275, 307, 464; position of Thessalonica, 126, 161, 299, 464; attitude of bishops of Constantinople, 126, 212, 275, 357; relation of Canons of Chalcedon to, 320; bishops supporting Dioscorus, 298; action of its bishops at Chalcedon, 299, 301, 303, 307. *See also* Diocese, Peter
Images: cultus of, 11 f.; imperial, 12; miraculous, 12; of Christ on tapestry, 34; Council of Elvira (*c.* 300) and, 12, 34; Epiphanius on, 12
Immorality, 454 f.
Incapacity, legal, 89, 92, 440 f., 456
India, Indians, 394: Christianity of, 397, 399 f.; commerce, 396. *See* Theophilus
Indian Ocean, 362, 386, 396, 399
Indies, 400
Indus, 400
Ingrates, 195
Innocent I., Pope (402-17): succeeds Anastasius, 46, 134; Decretal Letters, 21, 118, 130; attitude to Jerome, 46, 74, 134, 156; notified by Theophilus of Chrysostom's deposition (404), 71 f.; quashes the sentence, 71, 460 f.; letter to Theophilus, 72; attitude to canons of Nicæa, 72; relations with Emp. Honorius, 72, 138; his legates seized at Athens, 72; missions to Constantinople, 173, 182; renounces communion with Chrysostom's opponents, 73 f., 156, *cf.* 162, 202; letters to him, 73; relations with Victricius of Rouen, 21, 118, 130; with Exuperius of Toulouse, 21, 118; letter to Marcian of Naissus on "Bonosiaci," 123; relations with Thessalonica, 126; restoration of Bp. Photinus, 127; on metropolitical jurisdiction, 130; paganism at Rome under, 131, 137; absent from Rome during siege (410), 138; church building under, 452; on Anicia Faltonia Proba, 141; relations with Alexander of Antioch (415), 207 f., 250; on Cyprus, 250; proposal at Jerusalem to refer to him question of Pelagius, 153; Eustochium and, 156; appeals from Africa, 157; his judgement (417), 157 ff., 162, 185, 199; Augustine on it, 158; Pelagius and, 162 f., 165; Prosper on, 197; consecrates Julian of Eclanum, 182; death, 159; succeeded by Zosimus, 157, 159; character, 134
Inscriptions, 11, 66, 106, 128, 226, 337, 362, 398, 407, 445, 452 f., 468
Interpreter, use of, 153
Intolerance: Episcopal, 437; monastic, v., vi.
Iranians, 361, 363 f., 379
Ireland: home of Scoti, 145, 423, 426, 429; untrodden by Romans, 425; attacks on Britain, 423; conversion of, 189, 425; story of Palladius, 425, 429; of Patrick, 425-28, 429; Pelagius in, 145, 147, 189; culture in, 429 f.; asceticism, 427; *Collectio Hibernica*, 189
Irenæon, 214 f.
Irenæus, Bp. of Tyre (*c.* 446-48): a Count, friend of Nestorius, 238, 240, 270, 275; letter of Cyril, 238; accompanies Nestorius to Ephesus (431), 240; influence for him at Court later, 252; his "martyrology," 266; banished to Petra, 267; his "Tragœdia," 270; becomes metropolitan of Tyre, 275, 278; recognized by Proclus of Constantinople, 275; deposed by Theodosius II., 278 f.; successor appointed (448), 279, 291; deprived at *Latrocinium* (449), 291
Irene, St (*saec* i.), 66
Irish Sea, 427 f.
Iron, Desert of, 362
Isaac, Catholicos of Armenia: signs Consubstantialist memorial at Antioch (363), 372
Isaac the Great, Catholicos of Armenia (390-441 ?), son of Narses, 268, 371, 375 f.
Isaac, Bp. of Nineveh (*saec.* vi.), 213

Isaac, Bp. of Seleucia-Ctesiphon (*c.* 399-410), delegate of Council of Seleucia (410), 387
Isaac the monk: a Syrian, 54; said to have prophesied defeat of Valens (378), 54; founds monastery or hermitage at Constantinople, 54, 215, 252; hostile to Chrysostom, 54; accuses him at "The Oak," 63; subsequent effect, 25
Isaac the Jew (*saec.* iv.): the "Ambrosiaster," 455
Isaiah, prophet, 136, 354, 362; "Ascension of Isaiah," 122
Isaiah, Egyptian prophet († 488): career, 354; biography of, 317, 325, 354
Isaura, 337
Isauria, 337, 344 f., 351
Isaurians, 70, 73, 337. *See* Illus, Trocundus, Zeno
Isidore, Bp. of Seville (600-36), writings, 123
Isidore, priest of Alexandria (318-403): Nitrian monk, 38; Origenist, 35; made Xenodochus at Alexandria by Theophilus, 39; confidential position, 38; missions to Rome, Constantinople, and Palestine, 39; attempt to secure his election as Bp. of Constantinople (398), 39, 52, 58; negotiations with Jerome, 35; relations with John of Jerusalem, 35; quarrel with Theophilus and excommunication, 39; returns to Nitria, 39; received by the Tall Brothers, 39; great age, 39, 52; problematic visit to Constantinople, 42, 66; death, 42, 66
Isidore of Pelusium, monk († *c.* 449): personal history, 205; contemporary of Theophilus, 57; admirer of Chrysostom, 206; caustic reflexions on Theophilus, 206; on Cyril, 206, 256; on Eusebius of Pelusium, 206, 332; attempt to reconcile Rome and Alexandria, 208; writings, 57
Isis, 400
Islam, 394
Isonzo, 450
Israel, Israelites, 193, 397
Italians, 72, 118, 229, 297, 413; teachers in England, 430
Italy, 140, 185, 287, 423, 432, 465; imperial capital Milan, 49, 129; transferred to Ravenna, 129, 284, 322, 358; the Court at Rome (449), 293; the army of the East in, 49 f.; invasion of Alaric (402), 73, 106, 134; of Radagaisus (406), 106; and Alaric (408-10), 94, 108, 134, 201; Athaulf in (411), 110; invasion by Heraclian (412), 99; still free from barbarian settlements, 401; the "Italian" Empire [358], 461; Imperial Italy survives provinces (425), 445; invasion of Attila (451-2), 286, 413; threats of Vandals, 447; Italy under Ricimer (456-72), 415, 447 f., 458; disappearance of Empire (476), 418, 448 f.; under barbarian kings, 347, 358, 450, 467, 469; comparison with time of Hannibal, 469
Ecclesiastical organization, 18 ff.; in North Italy, 20, 117, 127-30, 181; papal jurisdiction, 182, 292, 322, 453, 456, 462 f., 465; secular authority and the Pope, 453, 465 f.; papal claims outside Italy, 124, 463 f.; *Libri Canonum*, 21; African superiority, 176; Arianism in, 458 f.; Manicheans in, 455 f.; Pelagian sympathies in, 146, 182, 199, 229; *cf.* 181, 457
Eusebius of Cremona, 37; and the affair of Jerome and Rufinus, 37, 43; envoys of Council of Carthage to, 92, 94; Paulinus of Nola in, 114; Nicetas of Remesiana in, 127; Cassian in, 190
Ithacius, Bp. of Ossonoba (*c.* 379-88), 118. *See* Priscillianism
Itinerary: of Antoninus, 426; of Etheria, 10, 113
Ivernia, 425. *See* Ireland.
Izates, King of Adiabene (*saec.* i.), 380

Jacob. *See* Aphraates
Jahbalaha, Bp. of Seleucia-Ctesiphon (*c.* 415-20), 387
James, Bp. of Nisibis (*c.* 325-50), 382
James, priest (*c.* 428), in Lydia, 250
James, Syrian Solitary (*c.* 344), 266, 335
James, pupil and opponent of Pelagius, 152, 164
Jason, Arian, "Doctor," 122
Jazdgerd I., King of Persia (399-420), attitude to Christians, 387 f.
Jazdgerd II., King of Persia (*c.* 438-57): Armenian revolt, 376 f.; propaganda of Mazdaeism, 376 f., 389; persecution of Christians, 377, 389
Jeremiah, 104, 362; Jerome's *Commentary* on, 46, 145, 151, 155
Jericho, 396
Jerome, St (346-420), 191: in Rome, 30; love of *Res Romana*, 139, and pagan literature, 45, 136; in Egypt, 30; his circle at Bethlehem, 29 f., 32, 47, 112, 118, 150; Jerome and Paula, 30, 133, and Paula the younger, 133, 155 f., and Eustochium, 133, 136, 155 f.; her death, 207, and Laeta, 133, and the two Melanias, 46, 133, 207; his friends in Italy, 37 f., 42 ff., 45, 207; early attitude to Origen, 28 ff., 37, 44, 152; as exegete, 29, 48, 152; later view of

Jerome, St—*continued*
Origen, 42 f., 47, 119; relations with Epiphanius, 30, 32 ff., 41, 119; visits him in Cyprus, 30; refusal to exercise priestly functions, 33; his brother Paulinian ordained by Epiphanius, 33; relations with John of Jerusalem, 31 ff., 34 ff., 41, 119, 155 f.; threatened with expulsion from Bethlehem, 34; quarrel with Rufinus, 34, 119, 132; his reconciliation (397), 36; fresh cause of quarrel, 37, 42 ff., 45 ff.; riot at Bethlehem, 155 f.; restoration, 206
Relations with Theophilus of Alexandria, 35 f., 74, 186, and Isidore, 35, and Pope Siricius, 36, and Eusebius of Cremona, 37, and Chromatius of Aquileia, 43 ff., and Paulinus of Nola, 45; Augustine, 45, 152, 155, 207, and Pope Anastasius, 38, 46, and Pope Innocent, 46, 134, 156, and Pammachius (*q.v.*), and Oceanus, 37, 42; Marcella, 74, 136; on Exuperius of Toulouse, Alethius of Cahors and Amandus of Bordeaux, 117, and Vigilantius, 119 f., and Fabiola, 132, and Anicia Faltonia Proba, 141, and Demetrias, 141, and Pelagius, 145, 150 f., 153 f., 156 f., and Annianus of Celeda, 206
Hydatius and Jerome, 406; Sulpicius Severus and, 118; Theodore of Mopsuestia and, 185, 207
Jerome on the fall of Rome (410), 136; on the site of Ararat, 362; on Brahmins, 397; his death (420), 207; loved by contemporaries, vi.; Collect for his Feast, 48
Works, vii., 48, 113, 147; style, 113; translations of Origen, 29, 37, 42, 46 ff.; *Chronicle*, 46; *De viris illustribus*, 29, 78, 397; *adv. Rufinum*, 30, 44 f.; *Contra Joan. Hierosol.*, 35, 41, 155; its date, 35; *Dial. adv. Pelag.*, 151, 155, 206; *Contra Vigilantium*, 119 f.; *Vita Hilarionis*, 395; *Comm. in Jeremiam*, 46, 145, 151, 155; *in Ezech.*, 46, 136, 155; *in Zech.*, 117; *in Ep. ad Gal.*, 152. Letters (*Ep.* 39), 132; (*Ep.* 51), 30, 34; (*Ep.* 55), 117; (*Ep.* 58), 119, (*Ep.* 60), 132; (*Ep.* 61), 119; (*Epp.* 64, 66), 132; (*Ep.* 67), 152; (*Ep.* 70), 397; (*Epp.* 77-8), 132; (*Epp.* 81, 84), 42; (*Ep.* 88), 43; (*Epp.* 88-91, 92, 93-4), 41; (*Ep.* 95), 43; (*Ep.* 96), 40; (*Ep.* 97), 58; (*Ep.* 98), 58; (*Epp.* 101-5), 152; (*Ep.* 107), 133; (*Ep.* 109), 119; (*Epp.* 110-12, 115-16), 152; (*Ep.* 121), 117; (*Ep.* 123), 107, 117; (*Ep.* 125), 117; (*Ep.* 127), 46, 135 f.; (*Ep.* 130), 140 f.; (*Ep.* 131), 151; (*Ep.* 132), 46, 151; (*Ep.* 133, to Ctesiphon), 46, 151, 206; (*Epp.* 135-37, 138), 156; (*Ep.* 143), 157, 207; translation of Bible, 152
Jerusalem: Jeremiah and, 104; Evagrius at, 29; Melania at, 29, 133; Aterbius at, 30; Epiphanius at, 31; Pinianus and Melania at, 142; Dedication Festival, 153; Orosius at, 153; Julian of Eclanum at, 185; Athenais Eudocia at, 276, 325; death of Helena of Adiabene at, 380; ascetics at, 216; factions at, 468. *See* Aelia
Church of J.: Jerome (*q.v.*) and, 136; proceedings against Pelagius at, 153 f.; *Tractoria* of Zosimus sent to, 181; letter of Pope Leo to, 334
Its importance, 157, 181; Council of Nicæa and, 318; organization of the Church, 464; its "Council," 283; pretensions of Bp. Juvenal, 238, 241, 249 ff.; attitude of Cyril of Alexandria, 319; Patriarchate, 241, 319 f., 464; relations with Antioch, 249 f., 319; and Cæsarea, 251, 318 f.; defeat of the "Theodosians," 327, 332, 380; monastic settlements, 324 f., 326 f.
Buildings: Monastery of St Euthymius, 294, 324; Convent of Passarion, 324; monastery on Mount of Olives, 325; Holy Places (*q.v.*), 406; Church of Holy Sepulchre, 36, 42, 381
Bishops: Eusebius' list of, 318; Cyril (*c.* 351-86), *q.v.*; John (386-417 ?), *q.v.*; Praylius (417-20), 163, 168; Juvenal (*c.* 420-58), *q.v.*; Anastasius (*c.* 458-78), 344, 353; Martyrius (*c.* 478-86), 353; Theodosius intruded bishop (*c.* 452-3), *q.v.*
Jew, Jews: Court of the "patriarchs," 14; settlements, 128; at Alexandria, 209; in Adiabene, 380; at Nehardea, 380; Jewish Christians, 380, 397; dislike of Christians in Persia, 382; controversy of Aphraates with, 381; propaganda in the Yemen, 397; opposition to Theophilus Blemmyas, 399; persecution in Armenia, 389; name as term of abuse, 300; schools of, 380. *See* Talmud, Ambrosiaster
Jezebel, 61, 64
Job, Tomb of, 10
Johannites, followers of St John Chrysostom, 69, 219, 258: credited with burning of St Sophia, 69; attitude of Atticus to, at Constantinople, 202; reconciliation (438), 271
John, St, Apostle: theology of, 13, 223; tomb at Ephesus, 241, 244; apocryphal Acts, 404
John Baptist, St, 67, 368
John, Bp. of Antioch (429-41): successor of Theodotus, 237; old friend of

Nestorius, 237; letter to Nestorius on the Messalians, 212; and on the *Theotokos*, 238; letter of Cyril to, 238, 302 f., and of Celestine to, 235, 238; detects Apollinarianism in Cyril's Anathemas, 238; letter to Firmus of Cæsarea, 238; promotes refutations of Cyril, 239; leader of Eastern representatives to Council of Ephesus (431), 243, 340; delay in arrival, 243, 246, 249; holds opposition Council, 247, 255, 263; deposition of Cyril, 247; Cyril attacks him, 248 f.; John not deposed, 249, 270, 390; secession of Cyprus from Antioch, 250; pretensions of Jerusalem, 249 ff., 319; proceedings before Count John at Ephesus, 251, 253; before Theodosius II., at Chalcedon, 253; John assailed by local clergy, 254; returns to Antioch, 255; treatment at Ancyra and Cæsarea, 258; again pronounces deposition of Cyril at Tarsus, 258; Pope Celestine and John, 257, 259; efforts of Emperor to reconcile John and Cyril, 259; Cyril's explanations, 261 f.; sacrifice of Nestorius, 263 f.; signs Formula of Union (433), 264, 314; letter to Theodosius, 264; opposition to his action, 265; Monophysitism at Antioch, 266; John invokes secular power, 266; Nestorius at Antioch, 267; John resists further demands of Cyril, 268 f.; signs "Tome" of Proclus, 269; relations with Cyril, 270 f.; his nephew and successor Domnus, 273, 278, 294; his character, 237 f.

John VI., Catholicos of Armenia (*saec.* x.), historian, 391

John, Bp. of Beit-Selok (*saec.* v.), martyr, 389

John, Bp. of Elche (*saec.* vi.), 464

John, Bp. of Germanicia in Commagene (*c.* 431-51), 390

John, Bp. of Jerusalem (386-417), 406; successor of Cyril, 31; his theological views, 31 f., 36, 38, 155; relations with Epiphanius, 31-35, 119; with Jerome, 31-35, 119, 150, 153, 155 f.; appeals to civil power, 34; relations with Rufinus and Melania, 31, 44; with Theophilus of Alexandria, 35; the affair of Paulinian, 33, 36; relations with Pope Anastasius, 44, with Pelagius, 150, 153, with Orosius, 153; the riot at Bethlehem, 155; letter of Pope Innocent to, 156; letter of Augustine, 158; death, 163

John of Beth-Rufin, Bp. of Maiouma (*saec.* v.), historian, successor of Peter of Iberia, 317

John, Bp. of Persia (*c.* 325), present at Nicæa, 381

John Codonatus (*saec.* v.), rejected Bp. of Apamea, 343; ejected from See of Antioch (477), 343; nominated to Tyre, 357

John Mantagouni, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 480-7), 378, 391

John Talaia, Bp. of Alexandria (482): monk of Canopus, later priest of A., 347; his undertaking at Constantinople, 347 f.; successor of Timothy Salofaciol, 348; not recognized at Constantinople, 348; accused of perjury by the Emperor, 354; flees to Rome, 348, 354; complains to Felix III. of Acacius of Constantinople, 355

John of Ægeum, priest (*c.* 483): historian viii., 317; on consecration of Peter the Fuller, 342; on massacre at Hierapolis, 345

John, deacon of Constantinople (*c.* 403): deposed by Chrysostom, accuses him at "The Oak," 63

John, monk of Antioch (*c.* 620), historian, on Emp. Zeno (475), 337

John, usurping Emperor (423-5), 178, 187

John, *Comes sacrarum largitionum*: at Ephesus (431), 251, 253

John, silentiary (*c.* 454), 330 f.

John the Eunuch: at Jerusalem (430), 325

John, physician of Cyril (*saec.* v.), at Constantinople, 252

John Diacrinomenus (*saec.* vi.), historian, 317

John Philoponus of Alexandria (*saec.* vi.), attacks Council of Chalcedon, 311

Jonah, 313

Jonas the Armenian, founder of monastery of Halmyrissos, 215

Jordan, 324

Jordanes, historian (*saec.* vi.), 413, 420

Joseph, patriarch, tomb of, 10

Joseph, St, 123

Joseph, Catholicos of Armenia, martyr (454), 377

Josephus, Flavius (37-100 ?), 380

Jousig, Catholicos of Armenia (373 ?), successor (?) of Narses, 375

Jousik, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 330), son of Urthanes, 371; treatment of King Diran and ill-treatment by him, 371

Jovian, Emp. (363-64): appoints Romanus Count of Africa, 78; abandons protectorate of Armenia by treaty with Sapor II. (363 A.D.), 365, 374; address of bishops at Antioch to (363), 372

Jovinian, heretic (*c.* 390), 123

Jovinian, ascetic in Gaul (*saec.* iv.), friend of Cassian, 191
Jovinus usurping Emperor (*c.* 411), 110, 160
Jovius, guardian and favourite of Honorius (*c.* 409), a pagan, procures toleration for Donatists, 94
Jucundus, Arian Patriarch of Carthage (*c.* 483), burnt alive, 438
Judas: Chrysostom and Nestorius compared with by Cyril of Alexandria, 211, 246
Judices, 434
Julian, Bp. of Antioch (*c.* 471-6), 343
Julian, Bp. of Cos, legate at Chalcedon (451), 297
Julian, Bp. of Eclanum (417-18, 454), 164; his personal history, 182; knowledge and ability, 183; consecrated by Pope Innocent, 182; relations with Paulinus of Nola, 164, 183; deposed as Pelagian by Pope Zosimus (418), 183; attacks Augustine's teaching, 184 ff.; ill-success in the East, 185; upheld by Theodore of Mopsuestia, 185 f., 229; relations with Nestorius at Constantinople, 229; attacked by Marius Mercator, 231; expelled from Constantinople, 231; alleged approval at Ephesus (431), of his deposition, 249; address to Pope Xystus III. (439), 199; opposition of the deacon Leo, 199; his writings, 184, 186; formulary attributed to him, 181
Julian (331-63), Emperor (361-63): grants toleration to Donatists, 76, 93; Anti-Catholic edicts, 86, 93; victories over barbarians, 105; overcome by Sapor, 372, 374, 381 f.; position after his death, 77, 93
Julian, son of Constantine III., executed (411), 110
Juliana, Anicia (*saec.* v.), 140 f., 151 (?), 168
Julius, Pope (337-52): Basilica of, 451; Apollinarian writings attributed to, 231, 245, 282
Julius, Bp. of Puteoli: papal legate at *Latrocinium* (449), 287 f.
Julius, St (*c.* 304?), 424
Julius Nepos, Emperor (474-75), 416, 449
Jupiter, 9
Jura, 24, 105
Justin II., Emperor (565-78), 213
Justina, Empress (*c.* 368-88), wife of Valentinian I., an Arian, 120
Justinian, Bp. of Valentia (*c.* 546), 123
Justinian, Emperor (527-65): Marcianites under, 213; attempt to settle Monophysite controversy, 318; organization in the Caucasus, 361; and in Armenia, 366; death, 270; "Codex Justinianus," 278, 342, 442
Jutes, 423
Juvenal, Bp. of Jerusalem (*c.* 420-58): baptizes the Sheik of *Parembolae*, 396; letter of Pope Celestine to, 235, 238; his fondness for intrigue, 238; a Cyrillian, 238, 240 f., 253 f., 314, 324; ambitions for a Patriarchate, 241, 249, 251, 319; opposed by Cyril, 251, 319; at Council of Ephesus (431), 244; delegate to conference at Chalcedon (431), 253; at Constantinople (431), 254, 258; on the side of Dioscorus, 285; at the *Latrocinium* (449), 287, 290 f.; censured by Pope Leo for "imperitia," 296; at Council of Chalcedon (451), 299; his priest Hesychius, 241; deserts Dioscorus, 301; monastic opposition to him at Jerusalem, 324, 326 f.; intrusion of Theodosius as bishop, 326 f.; restoration of Juvenal, 327; succeeded by Anastasius, 344, 353
Juvencus, poet (*saec.* iv.), 114

Kalaat-Semaan, 218
Karka, Kerka, 386, 389
Kerkuk, 381, 386
Khaiber, 397
Khaldis, 362
Khargeh, 267
Kharpout, 364
Khorassan, 377
Kings, Books of, 362
Kiud, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 465), 377 f.
Knitting, 408
Kokhe, 385
Kotchanes, 311
Kouban, 360
Koufa, 394
Kour, 361 f.
Kurds, 70, 337

Lactantius, L. Caecilius Firmianus (*saec.* iv.), 113, 152
Laeta, wife of Toxotius, son of Paula, 132; mother of the younger Paula, 132; Jerome and, 133
Laetus, African bishop (*c.* 484), burnt alive, 439
Laity: influence in elections, 15, 18, 328; in ordination, 86, 141 f., 218, 344; in restoration of penitents, 15; "protector" of, 17; acclamation in elections, 18; attitude to monks, 22; excommunication of, 68, 278, 414
Lampetius, heretic (*c.* 460): ordained priest at Cæsarea, 212; deprived, 213; influence, 213; the "Lam-

petians" or "Messalians," 213; his *Testament*, 213
Laodicea, 67; Council (*saec.* iv.), 10, 19, 387. *See also* Apollinaris, Helpidius
Laon, 444
Lapses, 441. *See* Apostasy
Laquedives, 399
Larissa, 125, 249. *See* Basil
Lateran, 132, 137, 173 f., 292, 407, 452 f.
Latin, 190, 297, 412: official language even in Eastern Empire (*saec.* v.), 308, 330; yet dividing West from East, 460; papal letters in Latin and Greek, 308; letter of John of Antioch to the Emperor, 264; Latin text of Acts of Council of Ephesus (431), 250; prevalent in "diocese" of Dacia, 125; difficulties of papal legates, 461; Pelagian controversy as one between Latins, 153
in Africa: difficulty of Valerius of Hippo in, 86; Latin subjects in Africa, 436 f.; culture almost abolished by Vandals, 432; pretended ignorance of Cyrila of Carthage, 439; curious names in Africa, 435, 441; Augustine and Jerome's version of Scriptures, 152; language of Orosius, 153
Deeply implanted in Gaul, 424; abolished in Britain except for clergy, 424; curious Latin of St Patrick, 428; Latin monasteries of Bethlehem, 155; Latin town in Scythia, 190 f.; language of Marius Mercator, 284; influence in theology, 224; "Latin Church," 347
Latins, 72, 74, 153, 155, 436 f., 461, 467
Latrocinium, 313. *See* Ephesus, Council (449)
Lauras, 324
Lauros, ad duas, 446
Laus perennis, 215
Lausiac history, 29 f., 51. *See* Palladius
"Laws of the Countries," 379
Lazarus, Bp. of Aix (409-12): accuser of Britius (*c.* 400), 117; compromised with Constantius III., 117; exiled in Palestine, 154; accuser of Pelagius, 154; relations with Orosius, 154, 156; letter to Africa, 156 f.; letter sent to Pope Innocent, 157; hostility of Pope Zosimus to, 162, 164; Pelagius and, 163
Lazarus of Pharbe, historian (*saec.* v.), 368, 376, 378
Ledan, 382
Legacies, 419
Legates, papal, 72, 170, 175, 178 f., 243, 286 f., 289, 291 f., 295 ff., 298 f., 318, 321, 323, 335, 452, 461
Legends: of St Germanus in Britain, 189; of St Maris in Persia, 379, 385; of St Thomas in India, 400, *cf.* 360; in apocryphal Acts, 404; evidence of legends for state of Britain, 430; in Procopius, 446; in story of Victricius of Rouen, 117; of St Thaddeus, 367; Armenian, 368 f.; of death of Nestorius, 315
Leiva, 406
Leman, Lake, 161
Lemellef, 77
Lent, 100, 174, 216
Leo, St, Pope (440-61), 198, 350: letter as archdeacon to Cassian on Nestorius, 196, 230; warns Xystus III. against Julian of Eclanum, 199; possible author of *De Vocatione* and *Hypomnesticon*, 200, 457; influence under Popes Celestine and Xystus, 467; archdeacon of Xystus, on mission in Gaul (440), 467; recalled to succeed Xystus, 467
Promotes trial of Manicheans in Rome (443-4), 405, 455; attitude to Pelagianism, 457; collection of errors of Eutyches, 278; used by Theodoret (447), 278; correspondence with Eutyches (448), 279, 282; invited to Council (449), 286; sends legates, 286 f.; letters to Emperors, to Flavian of Constantinople (*see* Tome *infra*), etc., 286; attitude to Eutyches, 286 f., 302, 457; Leo's letters evaded by Dioscorus at the Council at Ephesus (449), 288, 300; Flavian's appeal after the Council, 290, 292; report of the legate Hilary, 292, 461; appeal of Theodoret, 292; his restoration, 300, 309; Leo annuls the Council, 292 f., 412, 461; his view of responsibility of Dioscorus and Juvenal, 296; the *Latrocinium Ephesinum*, 313; Leo enlists support of Valentinian III., 293; reply of Theodosius II., 293, 412; Leo and consecrators of Anatolius of Constantinople, 294 f.; sends legates there, 295, 311; view of consecration of Maximus of Antioch by Anatolius, 309; policy of Pulcheria, 296; Leo's view of proposed Council (451), 297; yields to government pressure, 318; Leo excommunicated by Dioscorus, 298, 304, 306, 331; his instructions to Paschasinus, 297 f.; Council of Chalcedon and Tome of Leo, 302; Leo and Cyril, 302, 306 f., 317; Leo of Dioscorus? 307; Leo or Cyril? 307, 317 f.; deposition of Dioscorus, 304, 331; Monophysite view of Leo, 310, 326, 331, 349, 351, 458; Nestorius and Leo, 311 f., 314, 393; Leo and Nestorius, 457; Leo's view of Juvenal's pretensions for Jerusalem

Leo, St, Pope—*continued*
at Ephesus (431), 319; Cyril's letter about them, 319; Leo's legates and the pretensions of Constantinople at Chalcedon, 321; Leo's views, 321 f., 333; modified approval of Council, 323; trouble and efforts for peace in Palestine, 326 f.; Leo and Empress Eudocia, 327 f.; monastic opposition, 326, 329; Leo and Proterius of Alexandria, 329 f.; appeal of Proterians to, 333; his complaints of Anatolius' toleration of Eutychians, 333; efforts to maintain his position, 334; new doctrinal letter, 335; rejected by Timothy Aelurus, 335; Leo and Timothy Aelurus, 336; and Timothy Salofaciol, 336 f.; attitude of Peter Mongus to him, 350 f.; relations with Thuribius of Astorga, 404 f.; and Priscillianism, 405; the Latin Episcopate and the Tome, 412; Leo and Attila (452), 413, 467; and Genseric (455), 446, 467; founds monastery at Rome, 26; death of Leo, 468; character and ability, 284, 468; as seen by a civil official, 411; *petits vers*, 468
Leo on Pope Siricius and the delegation to Thessalonica, 126; on jurisdiction of Milan, 129; relations with Hilary of Arles (445), 409-12; Leo and Gallic jurisdictions, 410, 412; use of Roman text of Canon 6 of Nicæa at Chalcedon, 321; exercises discipline in Africa, 435
Theology: Leo's equipment, 284; his Christology as formulated in the Tome, 286, 306; and in the later doctrinal letter (Ep. 165), 335; in relation to that of Cyril vi., 302, 308 f., 317, 335; to passages quoted at Ephesus (431), 245; to that of Eutyches, 284 f., 286, 306 f.; treated by Monophysites as Nestorian, 310
Tome of Leo: addressed to Flavian of Constantinople (449), 286; its doctrine, 286; in opposition to Eutychian and Alexandrian views, 286; not read at the *Latrocinium* (449), 288; importance attached to it by Leo, 297, 306, 330, 412; efforts to secure adhesions in Gaul, 412; addition of quotations of authorities (450), 302; read at Chalcedon (451), 302; accepted by the Council, 304, 322; hesitation of Egyptians, 305; treated as norm of doctrine, 306, 330, 461; welcomed by Nestorius, 312; opposition excited by it, 323; rejected by Timothy Aelurus, 330, 340, and by Peter Mongus, 330;
Leo, St, Pope—*continued*
charged with obscurity, 334; large number of abjurations, 345; evaded in the Henotikon, 349; violence of opposition in Egypt, 457; condemned (491) by bishops of Armenia, Iberia, and Albania, 391
Decretal Letters, 21; letter to Maximus of Antioch, 251; (*Epp.* 62-4), 293; Synodal Letter (451), (*Ep.* 97), 129; letter to Theodoret (453), 341; others, 126, 308, 313, 322, 329, 334
Sermons, 293, 456 ff., 468; homily on Rome, 459
Leo, Armenian priest, martyr (454), 377
Leo, Emp. (457-74): created by Aspar, 331; husband of Verina, 337; crowned by Anatolius of Constantinople, 331; attitude to Council of Chalcedon, 331 f., 468; appeal of Proterians of Alexandria to, 333; orders punishment of the assassins, 333; tolerates Eutychians, 333; representations of Timothy Aelurus to, 333 f.; the imperial *questionnaire*, 334 f.; sends Pope Leo's new doctrinal letter to Timothy Aelurus, 335; enforces toleration of Chalcedon in Egypt, 468; gives his daughter Ariadne to Zeno the Isaurian, 337; proclaims their son Leo Augustus (473), 337; keeps Peter the Fuller in custody, 342 f.; chooses Anthemius (467) as Emperor of the West, 448; sends unsuccessful expedition to Carthage, 432; murders Aspar (471), 337; dies (474), 337, 343
Leo, grandson of Emp. Leo: son of Zeno and Ariadne, 337; proclaimed Augustus (473), 337; crowns his father (*c.* 474), 337
Leo, minister of Euric the Goth (*saec.* v.): a Catholic, 418
Leontian Martyrs (454), 377
Leontius, Bp. of Ancyra (*c.* 397), 67, 69
Leontius, Bp. of Arles (*c.* 455-82), 421 f.
Leontius, Bp. of Fréjus (*c.* 419-32), 190 f.
Leontius, Bp. of Salona (*saec.* iv.), deposed by Ambrose, restored by Damasus, 124, 130
Leontius, Gallic bishop (*saec.* v.), 191
Leontius, Emp. (*c.* 438), 351 f.
Leontius, rhetor of Athens, father of Athenais Eudocia, 275
Leontius (*saec.* vi.), possible author of *Contra fraudes Apollinaristarum*, 282
Lepers, 373
Leporius, monk of Trèves (*saec.* v.), 230, 235
Lérins: position of, 190; near Lero, 191; monasteries in, 24, 419; founded by Honoratus, 190, 407;

his successors, 420; relations with diocese of Fréjus, 25, 190, 420. *See also* Vincent
Lero, 191
Letters, papal, 21, 465. *See* Decretal
Levites (deacon), 468
Libellatici, 441
Liberatus, deacon of Carthage (*c.* 564): his *Breviarium*, 260, 268, 317, 329, 348, 358; defends the Three Chapters, 317; on the mission of Aristolaus, 265; on death of Flavian, 294, and of Timothy Aelurus, 346
Liber Censuum, 465
Liberius, Pope (352-66), 85, 451 f. *See also* Basilica
Liber Pontificalis, 26, 38, 137, 159 f., 424, 456
Liber Regularum, 118, 130
Libia, 406
Libius Severus, Emp. (461-5), 415, 448, 468
Libri Canonum, 21
Libya: deserts of, 72, 267; provinces of, 240; barbarians on frontier, 133; condition (*saec.* v.), 204; clergy of, 348; bishopric of Ptolemais in, 253
Libya Cyrenaica, heresy in, 203
Licinius, Emp. (308-24), 368, 395
Liguria, 129
Lilybæum in Sicily, Goths at, 432. *See* Paschasinus
Limoges, 417
Lincoln, See of, 424. *See* Adelfius
Lipari, 111
Litany, 8
Literature in Britain, 430; in France, 430; in Ireland, 429; in Provence, 418 f.
Liturgist, Peter the Fuller as, 352
Liturgy, 16; time and frequency, 7; form of, 8; at shrines, 11; in relation to ancient sacrifices, 112; refusal of Jerome and Vincent to celebrate, 33; celebration of, as mark of reconciliation, 36; mention of names in, 208 (*see* Diptychs); custom of sitting during Gospel, 399; recitation of Creed of Nicæa in, 352; language of, in Armenia, 370, and in Persia, 381. *See* Mysteries
Livania, 151, 188
Lodève, 408. *See* Maximus
Logos, [228], 341. *See* Christology
Logroño, 406
Loire: and Armorica, 109, 402; Attila at the, 413; Saxon pirates at mouth of, 414
Lombards, 182
London, 424, 426. *See* Restitutus
Lots, casting of, 353
Lucania: bishops of, 21; Alaric in, 109, 136
Lucentius, Bp. of Ascoli in Picenum, legate of Leo to Chalcedon, 297
Lucidus, priest of Riez (*c.* 473-4), 421
Lucifer, Bp. of Calaris (*c.* 354-71), schism, 453
Lucilla, widow of Carthage (*c.* 311), opponent of Cæcilian, 84
Lucius, Anti-Pope of Alexandria (*c.* 367-78), 56, 395
Lucius, King (*saec.* ii.), story of, 424
Lucius Verus (*saec.* ii.), 385
Lucullus in Armenia (66 B.C.), 364; mansion of, 449
Lugdunensis, Civitas, 415. *See* Lyons
Lugdunensis Tertia, province of, 414, *cf.* 421
Lugo, 405. *See* Agrestius
Luni, 130
Lupercalia, 451
Lupus, St, Bp. of Troyes (426-79): secular career, 418; in Britain, 188 f.; conference with Attila, 413
Lusitania: Suevi in, 402; metropolis Emerita, 404 f. *See* Antoninus
Luxury, 53, 131, 155
Lycaonia, 337: Messalians in, 212; province of, 334
Lycia, 61, 212
Lycus, 362, 374
Lydda, 41, 154. *See* Dionysius, Diospolis
Lydia: Quarto-decimans in, 221, 250
Lyons: Burgundians at, 415, *cf.* 421; Sidonius Apollinaris at, 415 f., 420; dedication of Cathedral, 420; MS. of Cathedral, 100. *See* Eucherius

MACARIUS, Bp. of Magnesia *ad Sipylum* (*c.* 403): at Synod of the Oak, 62; his learning, 62
Macarius of Tkôou (*saec.* v.), 298
Macarius of Rome (*saec.* iv.), Rufinus translates Origen for, 36 f.
Macarius, Roman official in Africa (*c.* 347), enforces Donatist reunion, 92 f.
Maccabees, 327, 378
Macedonia: "Diocese" of, 125, 334; province of Illyricum, 106; Stilicho's designs on, 106; language, Greek, 125
Bishops of: Decretal Letter of Pope Innocent to, 21; holding jurisdiction from the Pope, 234; Nestorius and their theology, 234; John of Antioch on, 238; at Council of Ephesus (431), 242; led by Flavian of Philippi, 242; Emp. Leo and, 334
Macedonians, followers of Macedonius, Bp. of Constantinople (336-60): "Homoiousians," 122; in Armenia, 201; in province of the Hellespont, 221; Nestorius and, 221, 242; their end, 221. *See* Philotheus
Macriana, 77. *See* Deuterius
Macrobius (*c.* 400), 131

Madain, 386
Maestricht, 403
Magi: introduced by Persians in Armenia, 377; revolt of Vahan the Magus, 378; organization in Persia, 379 f., 388; dislike of Christians, 382; instigate persecution, 382 f., 388; in Cappadocia, 388; Theodore of Mopsuestia on, 388
Magic: at Athens, 351; Persian Christians charged with, 383
Magister Militum, 106, 187, 299, 407, *cf.* 82
Magister Officiorum, 78, 94, 299
Magistriani, 345
Magnentius, Emp. (350-53), 76
Magnesia, Battle of (190 B.C.), 363
Magnesia *ad Sipylum*, 62. *See* Macarius
Mahomet II. (1451-81), 104, 226
Mahoze, 386
Maiouma. *See* Peter of Iberia, John
Maipherqat. *See* Marutas
Majorian, Emp. (457-61): set up by Ricimer, 415, 448; panegyrized by Sidonius Apollinaris, 416; his career, 448; in the imperial tradition, 449; removed by Ricimer, 448, 468; his *Novellae*, 411
Majorinus, schismatic bishop of Carthage (311-15), 83
Maketes, 205
Maktaba, 389
Malalas, Joannes, historian (*saec.* vii.), 343
Malatia, 365
Malchus, Byzantine historian (*saec.* vi.), 431, 437
Maldives, 399
Malpatus, Messalian, 213
Mamertus, Bp. of Vienne (463-75), 421. *See also* Claudian
Mamigouni, Vahan (*c.* 485): "the Magus," 378; leads successful rebellion in Armenia, 378, 391
Manavazakert, 372
Manazgerd, 377
Manchu, 384
Mandaites, 380
Manes, 456
Manicheans, Manicheism, 184; prosecuted under Diocletian, 454, 456; prevalence in Africa, 454; organization and doctrine, 193, 454 f.; elements in, 380; Augustine's experience of, 85, 186, 456; his controversy with, 121, 421, 454; activities, 212; case of Philip the priest, 233; of Maximus of Valence, 408; vigorous steps of Pope Leo against (443-4), 405, 455 f.; action of Emp. Valentinian, 456; persecution by Huneric in Africa, 437 f. *See* Clementianus, Faustus, Fortunatus
Manuscripts, 189; Bobbio, 122; writings of Faustus of Riez, 420; Toledo, 293; of *Historia Miscellanea*, 316; of *Encyclia*, 334; of Pelagian treatise, 147; of the Book of Heraclides, 311; "Martyrology," 384; of Gallican Councils, 408; of documents of Chalcedon, 308; of African conference (484), 444; Book of Armagh, 426
Maouvia, queen of the Saracens (*saec.* iv.), 395
Marcella, Roman matron († 410): her community on the Aventine, 26, 131; her ward, Principia, 131, 135; protests against Rufinus' translations of Origen, 37; representations to Pope Anastasius (*c.* 400), 38; relations with Jerome, 74, 136; ill-treatment by Goths, 135; death, 135 f.
Marcella, *Cubicularia* of Pulcheria (*saec.* v.), 260
Marcellinus, Chronicles (*saec.* vi.): *Chronicle*, viii., 295, 421, 442; sources, 293
Marcellinus, governor of Dalmatia (*c.* 456), 415
Marcellinus, tribune and notary († 413): brother of Apringius, 99; sent by Honorius to Africa (410-1), 95; presides at Conference of Catholics and Donatists, 95 ff., 99 f., 150; in pious circles at Rome, 131, 146; works of Augustine addressed to, 146, 150; acquaintance with Pelagius, 146; suspected for Heraclian's revolt, 99; executed by Marinus (413), 100
Marcellus, St, Pope (307-9), Church of, 173
Marcellus, St, Abbot of Akoimetai (*c.* 449), 213 f.
Marcellus, *memorialis* (*c.* 411), account of Conference with Donatists, 100
Marcian, Bp. of Naissus (*c.* 409), 123
Marcian, monk of Bethlehem (*saec.* v.), 353
Marcian, Emp. (450-57): senator and soldier, married by Pulcheria, 295, 446; she invests him as Emperor, 295; his age, 295; attitude of Dioscorus of Alexandria to, 296; attitude to Council of Chalcedon (451), 298 f., 307 f., 331; his speeches in Latin and Greek, 308; refers claims of Jerusalem to the Council, 319; protest of Pope Leo to (as to Can. 28), 322; shows mercy to Nestorius, 314 f.; letter to monks of Palestine, 327, and to monks of Alexandria, 330; ratifies election of Avitus as Western Emperor (455), 447; mistakes of Agathangelus as to, 368; death (457), 328, 331 f., 368

Marcian, banker (*saec.* vi.), 213
Marcianites: Messalians, 213
Marcianopolis. *See* Dorotheus
Marcion, 114
Marcionites, 274
Marcus, Pope (336), Basilica of, 451
Mardin, 363
Marguérite, Ste., 191
Mari, Maris, a "Persian" of Beth-Ardaschir (*c.* 433), 273, 309
Maria, daughter of Stilicho (*saec.* v.): wife of Emp. Honorius, 107
Marina, daughter of Arcadius (403-49), 201, 236
Marinus, Count of Africa (413): defeats and executes Heraclian, 99, and Apringius and Marcellinus, 100
Maris, St (†82): evangelizer and first bishop of Persia, 385; value of the legend, 379, 385
Maris. *See* Mari
Marius Mercator (*saec.* v.); his personal history, 231, 284; Cyrillian and anti-Pelagian, 284; violence, 284; lack of accuracy, 123; on Bonosus, 123; on Pelagius at Rome, 145, and in Palestine, 168; on Pelagius' Commentary on St Paul, 147; on treatment of Celestius by Atticus of Constantinople, 162; on the *Tractoria* of Zosimus, 181, 185; on Julian of Eclanum and Zosimus, 183; on Creed of Theodore, 185, 284; on sermons of Nestorius against Pelagianism, 231, and his counter-anathemas to Cyril, 239; the *Commonitorium*, 231; *Liber subnotationum*, 145, 183; other quotations, 151, 168
Mark, St, 304, 348
Mark, a Photinian (*c.* 401-17), 122
Mar-Mattai, monastery of, 381
Marolus, Bp. of Milan (*c.* 411), 128
Marriage, 182: and penance, 6; married men as clergy, 114, 426, 468; as bishops, 182, 188, 204, 275, 410, 447; a married virgin, 127; Narses on indissolubility of marriage, 373; Manichean view of, attributed to Augustine, 184, 186; Augustine's reply, 186; marriage of two sisters to one man, 107. *See also* Celibacy
Marsa, widow of Promotus (*c.* 400), 54
Marsala, 297. *See* Lilybæum
Marseilles, Massilia: monasteries at, 24, 190, 194; bishopric of, in relation to province of Narbonnensis II[a], 130, 161; shrine of St Victor, 191; Cassian at (*q.v.*); Prosper and Hilary, 194, 196; Gennadius, 341; Salvian, 419; Euric master of (477), 422 f.
Bishops: Proculus (*c.* 381-428 ?), *q.v.*; Venerius (*c.* 431-51), 196, 409
Martial, former Master of the Offices, at Chalcedon, 299
Martin, Pope (649-53), 160
Martin, St, Bp. of Tours (372-97): a soldier, 117; monk-bishop, 112; reputation for asceticism, 18, 112, 413; gives impulse to monasticism in Gaul, 24, 116, 403; opposition of St Britius, 116; contrasted with Ausonius, 113; with Ambrose and Augustine, 113; attitude to Paulinus and Theresa, 115 f.; friend of Victricius of Rouen, 117 f., 425; Sulpicius Severus and, 116 ff.; church of St Martin at Withorn, 427
Martyrium, 307
Martyrius, Bp. of Antioch (460-70), 342
Martyrius, Bp. of Jerusalem (*c.* 478-86), 353
Martyrologies, 266, 384
Martyropolis, 386
Martyrs, 301; anniversaries of, 8, 114 f.; relics, 11; in Africa, 436 ff.; Donatist "sons of the Martyrs," 91; Armenian, 368, 377; in Britain, 424 f.; in Egypt (Cyril and the assailant of the Prefect Orestes), 210; in Media, 389; in Persia, 383 ff., 387 ff.; in Rome, 453
Marutas, Bp. of Maipherqat (*c.* 400): not the author of the martyrology, 384; influence at Persian Court, 386 f.; secures holding of Council of Seleucia (410), 386 f. *See* Maruthas
Maruthas, Syriac-speaking Mesopotamian bishop: at Synod of the Oak (403), 62
Mary, Virgin, 246: "children" of, 123; "Mary Church" at Ephesus, 244 ff.; meaning of its title, 244, 452; dedication of Liberian Basilica at Rome, 452. *See also* Christology, Theotokos
Marzban, 376 ff.
Mascezel, brother of Gildo, lands in Africa (398), 85
Massaoua, 396
Massilia, 130, 341. *See* Marseilles
Matthew, St: in Ethiopia, 397; *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, 122; monastery of Mar-Mattai, 381
Matthias, St: in the Caucasus, 360
Maurice, St (*saec.* iii.), 215
Mauritania: Decretal Letter of Pope Celestine to bishops of, 21; disciplinary action of Pope Leo in, 435; Donatist practice as to admission of "traditores" in, 77; Rogatists in, 80, 83; revolt against Count Romanus (372), 80; fear of Optatus in, 83; Vandals in provinces of (429), 194 f., 431 f.; provinces restored to the Empire (442), 432, 435. *See* Cæsarea, Tipasa

Mauritania Cæsariensis, 435, 442
Mauritania Sitifensis, relics in, 11
Mauritania Tingitana, 165
Mausoleum, 131, 307
Maxima Cæsariensis, 423
Maximian, Bp. of Constantinople (431-34): consecrated successor to Nestorius, 254 f.; character, 254; approval of Pope Celestine, 257; relations with Nestorians, 258; supports Cyril, 260; notified of the reconciliation, 264; death, 266
Maximian, Donatist bishop of Carthage (*c.* 393), 83 f.; schism, 84, 89 f.
Maximin, Arian bishop: in controversy with Ambrose (383), 121; lands in Africa with Count Sigisvult (427), 121, 194; in controversy with Augustine, 121 f.; condemned in Sicily, 122; advises Genseric to persecute (440), 122; possibly not the same, 121; character and ability, 121; writings, 122, 124
Maximin Daia, Emp. (307-14), 366, 370
Maximus, Bp. of Antioch (451-6 ?): replaces Domnus, 294, 308; his former career, 269, 294 (*see* Maximus, monk and deacon, *infra*); selected and consecrated by Anatolius of Constantinople, 308 f.; attitude of Pope Leo to, 309; changed attitude to Tome of Leo, 296; letter of Leo to, 251; at Council of Chalcedon, 299; replaced (455-6), 341
Maximus, Bp. of Constantinople (*c.* 380-81): supported by Peter of Alexandria, 58
Maximus, Bp. of Demetrias (*c.* 422), ordination annulled by Pope Boniface, 250
Maximus, Bp. of Lodève (*c.* 422), accused of Manicheism, 408
Maximus, Bishop of Riez (433-51 ?), abbot of Lérins (426-33), 420
Maximus, Bp. of Salona (*saec.* iv.), 124
Maximus, first bishop of Turin (*c.* 390), 128
Maximus, monk and deacon of Antioch (*saec.* v.): hostility to Theodore of Mopsuestia, 269, 277; and Diodore of Tarsus, 266; application to Cyril of Alexandria, 266, 269; friend and possible inspirer of Eutyches, 277; source of trouble to John of Antioch, 294; probably succeeded Domnus as bishop, 294 (*see* Maximus, Bp. of Antioch, *supra*)
Maximus usurping Emperor (*c.* 383), 107
Maximus: proclaimed Emperor by Gerontius (*c.* 409), 109
Maximus, physician of Thenæ (*saec.* v.): Eunomian converted by Augustine, 121
Maxula, 434
Mayence, 106
Mazdæans: Persian, conversions among, 387; opposition of Mazdæan clergy, 394; fanaticism of Jazdgerd II., 376 f., 389
Mazdæism: in Persia, 376, 379; system of, 379 f.; upheld by Sassanids, 364, 369; persecution of Persian Christians in interests of, 382 f.; propagation in Armenia, 364, 376 f., 390; opposition of Narses to, 372
Maziques, 310
Meched Ali, 394
Medes, 363
Media, 363; Christians of, 379, 389
Media Atropatena, 364
Medina, 397
Mediterranean, 161, 396, 432
Melania the elder (*c.* 350-410): leaves home on Cælian Hill at Rome (372), 132; her son Publicola, 132, 133 f.; paganism in her family, 133, 451; settles at Jerusalem, 132; community on Mount of Olives, 30, 133; care for Evagrius, 29; friend of Palladius, 29 f., and Rufinus, 29, 43, her director, 134; interest in Origen, 29 f.; relations with John of Jerusalem, 31, 44; varying relations with Jerome, 46, 207; her grandchildren, 133, 207; determines to revisit Rome, 133; lands at Naples (402), 133; visit to Paulinus, 127, 133; meets Nicetas of Remesiana, 127; conversion of Apronianus and Avita, 134; visit to Africa, 134; death in Palestine (405), 133, 134; attitude of her friends to Pelagius, 150; an example of asceticism, 112
Melania the younger (*c.* 383-437 †): daughter of Publicola and Albina, 132, 207; her uncle Volusianus, 451; home on the Cælian Hill, 134, 168, 207; marriage to Pinianus, 133; loss of her children, 133; determination to renounce the world, 133 f.; opposition of Publicola, 134; hospitality to exiled Johannite bishops (405), 74, 135; friend of Rufinus, 135; at death-bed of Rufinus (410), 136; journey to Africa, 141; at Carthage and Thagaste, 141; at Hippo, 141 f.; relations with Augustine, 141 f.; arrival at Jerusalem, 142; founds monasteries on Mount of Olives, 325; friendship with Pelagius, 168; instruction by Augustine on Pelagian teaching, 168; at death-bed of Jerome (420), 207; her death (439), 325; succeeded by her almoner Gerontius, 325, 353; "Life" by Gerontius, 133

Meletius, Bp. of Antioch (361-81), 237
Melidas, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 454), 377
Melitene, metropolis of Armenia II[a], 365 f. *See* Acacius
Melkite, meaning of, 337
Membressa, 84. *See* Salvius
Memnon, Bp. of Ephesus (*c.* 431): Cyrillian, 242; at Council of Ephesus (431), 244; treatment of Nestorius, 242, and of the Easterns, 247; deposed by John of Antioch and the Easterns, 247 f., 249; disregards deposition, 247, 251; placed under arrest, 251, 255; imperial decision, 255
Memor, Bp. (*c.* 408-9): father of Julian of Eclanum, 182; friend of Augustine, 182; possibly Bp. of Eclanum, 182
Memorialis, 100
Memory, influence on tradition, 426
Menas, St, 214
Mende, 417
Mendicity, 373
Merobaudes, general and consular (*saecc.* iv., v.), 105
Meropus of Tyre, explorer (*saec.* iv.), 397
Merouzanes, Armenian bishop (*saec.* iii.), 366
Merulana, Domus, 458
Merv, oasis of, 378, 381
Mesene, 386
Mesopotamia: Romans in (*saec.* iii.), 364; province of, 365; relations with Persia (*saec.* v.), 386; Bedouins of, 217; monks in deserts of, 23; Syriac speaking bishop from, at Synod of the Oak, 62; exile of Johannites from, 72; monks from Mesopotamian Syria at the *Latrocinium* (449), 287; monks in district of Amida, 340 f. *See also* Adelphius, Maruthas
Mesrob, monk and teacher (354-441): secures translation of Greek and Syriac books into Armenian, 268, 376
Messalians: activities of, 212 f., 214 f.; Lampetians, 212 f.; Marcianites, 213; "rule" of Alexander, 213, 215; absorbed in Paulicians (*saec.* vii.), 213. *See* Adelphius
Messina, 109, 135 f.
Methone, 190
Metrodorus, philosopher and explorer (*saec.* iv.), 397
Metropolitan, 125, 130, 240, 406, 412, 465
Metz, 413
Metzketh, 361
Meuse, 105
Micah, Tomb of, 10
Michael, Archangel, cult of, 10
Michael the Syrian, Patriarch of Antioch (1166-99), 334 f.
Mihr, temple of, 369
Milan: residence of the Emperor (*saec.* iv.), 20, 49; loss of prestige on transfer of capital to Ravenna (*c.* 404), 129; capture by Attila (452), 413
  Stilicho at, 49; Augustine at, 85, 121; Paulinus of Nola at, 115; Philastrius at, 128; Hilary and Auxentius, 128
  Church of: in relation to Upper Italy, 19 f., 127, 129; importance as Imperial See, 20, 43, 129; extent of its jurisdiction (*saec.* iv.), 128, (*saec.* v.), 129, 412; African property of, 148; metropolitan of Milan consecrated by metropolitan of Aquileia and *vice versa*, 463; Arians at, 121; Council (451), 412
  Relations with Africa, 20, 89; with Antioch, 254; with Aquileia, 20, 129, 463; with Constantinople and Easterns, 71 f., 129; with Danube Provinces, 20; with Gaul, 20; with Rome, 43, 72, 412; with Spain, 20
  Bishops: Auxentius (*c.* 364), 128, 440; Ambrose (374-97), *q.v.*; Simplicianus (*c.* 397-400), *q.v.*; Venerius (401-11), *q.v.*; Marolus (*c.* 411), 128
Miles, Bp. of Susa (*saec.* iv.), 385
Miletus, 221
Milevis, Mileu, Milevum, 79; Council (416 ?), 157. *See* Optatus
Miltiades, Pope (310-14), 84
Minervius, monk (*saec.* v.), 191
Mines, 267
Mirabella, 182
Miracles: in life of St Martin, 112; at tomb of Ammonius, 66; attributed to Epiphanius, 31; in Africa, 442; of the Arian Theophilus at Antioch, 398; in Armenia, 367 f.; at Bari, 299; celebrated at Constantinople, 442; at Ephesus, 299; in Iberia, 361; at Naples, 299; in Palestine, 395 f.
Mirian, King of Georgia (*saec.* iv.), 361
Misael, chamberlain (*saec.* vi.), 354
Misenus, Bp. (*c.* 483): envoy of Pope Felix III., 355
Missions: in Po valley, 128; in the Alps, 129; in Armenia, 367 f., 370 f.; among Arabs and Indians, 394-400; to Britain from Gaul, 424; in the Caucasus, 360 f.; in Gaul, 117; in Ireland, 189, 425-9; in Media, 389; in Persia, 379, 385; of Messalians on the Euphrates, 213; in the Far East, 400; Jewish, in Adiabene, 380; in Phœnicia, 70; among the Goths, 54, 70; in Dacia, 127
Mithradates (135-69 B.C.), 363

Mitylene, 316. *See* Zacharias
Moab, 136
Mobed, 379, 381, 388
Mobedan-mobed, 380 f.
Mocius, St, 66
Modalism, 27, 341
Moden, 190
Mœsia : Goths in, 120, 334 ; province of Mœsia Superior, 125, 127, 334
Monasticism, monks : ideal of, 5 f., 22, 102 f. ; admiration of Theodoret for, 274 ; the *laus perennis*, 214 f. ; criticisms, 22, 116 f., 119 ; as viewed by the State, 3, 327, 350 ; popularity in the East, 216 ; development in East and West, 23 ff. ; differences, 24 f. ; not favoured at Rome, 26, 159 ; monks excluded from clergy there, 26, 159 ; Pope Zosimus on usurpation of, 125 ; Fabiola and relief of, 132 ; maintenance of a monk, 340 ; Isidore's means, 41 ; slaves as, 24 ; dress, 22 f., 395, 409
Organisation, 23, 25 ; Cassian's *Institutes*, 191 ; efforts of Chrysostom to enforce discipline, 52 ; Pope Zosimus and (418), 125 ; John of Jerusalem and, 34, 155 f. ; St Euthymius and, 324 ; regulations of Council of Chalcedon (451), 24 f. ; of Council of Arles (455), 25 ; of imperial government (471), 342 f.
Monks as bishops : in Gaul, 112, 191 f., 407 f., 409 ; at Antioch, 207, 294, 342 ; at Constantinople, 220, 229 ; at Tarsus, 258
Books in monastic cells, 41 ; monastic writings, 29, 47, 113 f., 191, 205 f., 270, 277 ; career of Evagrius, 28 f., and of Palladius, 29 f.
Relations of monks and bishops, 35 : (in Egypt), Theophilus and, 38-42, 57, 60, 66, 118, 156 ; Cyril and, 232, 236, 240, 266 ; Dioscorus and, 324 ; Peter Mongus and, 350 f. (At Constantinople) opposition to Chrysostom, 54 f., 63, 216 ; to Nestorius, 216, 228 f., 234, 239 f. ; to Flavian, 216, 289, and Anatolius, 216. (In Gaul), 25, 409, 420. (In Armenia), fostered by Narses, 373. (In Palestine), John of Jerusalem and Bethlehem, 34 f., 155 f. ; opposition to Juvenal, 326 f. ; and his successors, 353. (In Syria), 328, 340.
Influence and importance : papal letters to, 286, 292 ; imperial letters to, 326 f. ; letter of Cyril to, 236 ; influence of the Tall Brothers, 39, 66 ; monastic influence at Court of Theodosius II., 252, 260, 276 f., 280 ; influence of Eutyches, 227, 260, 277, 280 ; Barsumas summoned to the *Latrocinium* (449), 285 ; the Council sides with monks against Flavian, 289 ; heads of monasteries at Chalcedon (451), 305 ; signature of archimandrites to condemnation of Eutyches, 283 ; Simeon Stylites and others consulted by government (458), 218, 335 ; "Henotikon" addressed to monks, 348 ; power of Peter the Fuller, 342
Theological interests : reasons for popularity of Origen in Egypt and Palestine, 28 ff. ; Origen disliked by Pacomians, 30 ; anthropomorphism, 32, 38, 40 ; Apollinarian views in Armenia, 269, 390 ; Messalians at Constantinople, 214 f. ; monastic opposition at Chalcedon, 24, 216, 305 f. ; support for Chalcedon in monastery of Dius, 328, 358 ; detestation of it in Palestine, 325-28 ; Monophysitism among Mesopotamian monks, 340 f. ; theological limitations, 287 ; attraction of Monophysitism, 341 ; controversies in grace and predestination in Africa and Gaul, 193 f. ; Pelagianism (*q.v.*)
Monastic intolerance, v., vi., 210, 292 ; stirred against paganism, 23, 216 ; against "heresy," 23 f., 35, 38, 240, 270, 277, 279 ; attitude of Nitrian monks to Simeon Stylites, 217
Restlessness and turbulence : life in deserts, 22 f., 41, 47, 213 (*see also* Nitria) ; wanderings of monks, 23, 52, 210, 270, 297, 324, 342 f., 350 ; violence, 25 f., 210, 287, 293, 326 f., 468 ; disturbances at Alexandria, 38, 210, 350 f., *cf.* 468 ; at Constantinople, 270, 328, 358 f. ; at Chalcedon (451), 24, 216, 305 f. ; in Palestine, 155, 326 f., 353, *cf.* 468 ; at Antioch, 342 f.
Monasteries : in Adiabene (Mar-Mattai), 381. In Africa, 141 (Hadrumetum), 193. In Armenia, 269, 376. In Britain, 424. At Constantinople (including Chalcedon) of Acoemeti, *q.v.* ; of Dius, 215, 328, 358 ; of Isaac, 54, 215, 252 ; of St Bassa at Chalcedon, 342 ; of *Rufinianæ*, 214 f., 254. In Egypt, at Canopus, 339, 346 f. ; in the Delta, 191 ; in Nitrian desert, the cells, 29, 191 (*see also* Nitria) ; Sinai, 326 ; (St Catherine, 395) ; Pelusium, 205. In Gaul, 24 f., 418 ; Lérins and islands, 24, 190, 407 f., 419 f. ; Marseilles, 24, 190 f., 194 ; St Maurice, 215 ; Trèves, 230 ; in the Jura, 24. In Ireland, 427, 429 f. In Palestine and Syria, 30 f., 274, 324, 326 ; Ad Vetus, 31, 33 ;

Bethlehem, *q.v.*; on Mount of Olives, 30, 133 f., 324 f.; at the Tower of David, 325; near Maiouma, 326; at *Parembolae*, 395 f.; of St Euthymius, 294, 324; of Passarion, 324; at Antioch (Euprepius), 220, 267; at Apamea, 294; in Mesopotamian Syria, 287; at Tekoa, 325, 353. In Persia, 383. At Rome, 26. In Spain, 312, (Galicia) 113. In Thrace, at Halmyrissos, 215
Mondonedo, 423
Money, right of coining, 450
Monobazus, brother of Izates of Adiabene (*saec.* i.), 380
Monophysites, Monophysitism, Chap. xii. *passim*. Relations with Apollinarianism, 222, 228, 266, 277; orthodox beginning, 224. Party intrigues, 280; attitude to Chalcedon and to Pope Leo, 310, and Nestorius, 315. Forged treatises, 228. Doctrinal policy of the party, 305, 310. Defence of Bp. Theodosius in Palestine, 327. Eusebius of Pelusium, 206, 332. Peter of Iberia, 390. Affairs in Egypt, 331 f. Tendencies in Armenia, 391. Divisions at Edessa, 391 f. Propaganda in Persia, 393; violence, 341. At Antioch, 343. *See also* Severus
Monotheism, 225
Moors, 80, 195, 438
Mopsuestia, 353; Julian of Eclanum at, 185 f., 211, 229; theology of, 269. *See* Theodore
Morality, Christian, 18, 22, 146, 371. *See* Ethics
Morini, 117
Moses, patriarch, 206
Moses, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 457), 377
Moses of Chorene, date of, 367
Moses, the solitary, Bp. of the Saracens (*c.* 375), 395
Mosul, 381, 394
Mother of Christ, of God, of Man. *See* Christology
Mouch, 372
Mourad-Sou, 372
Muirchu Maccu-Machteni (*saec.* vii.), 425
Muritta, deacon of Carthage (*saec.* v.), 442
Musæus, Bp. (*c.* 430), 238
Muses of Helicon, 69
Musonius, primate of Byzacena (*c.* 397), 87
Mutilation, 39, 111, 442
Mysteries, Holy: in open country, 68
Mysticism, 183, 277, 341

NAAMAN, 394
Nabarnougi. *See* Peter of Iberia
Nablus, 327
Naharmalka, 385
Naissus, 123, 127. *See* Bonosus, Marcian
Namma, son of Nubel the Moor (*saec.* iv.), 80
Nanea, goddess, 369
Nanterre, 217. *See* Geneviève
Naples, Melania at (402), 133; Capreolus at, 433; mansion of Lucullus near, 449; marvel at, 299
Narbonensis: provinces N. Prima and N. Secunda, 407, 410. Position of bps. of N. II[a] in relation to Marseilles, 130, 161; interference by Pope Zosimus, 161. Jurisdiction of Patroclus of Arles, 161, 407. Alteration under Honoratus and Hilary, 407. Strictures of Pope Celestine, 21, 196, 409. Attitude of Pope Leo, 410
Narbonne: Decretal Letters to bishop, 21; province of (*see* Narbonensis); coveted by Goths, 402; protected by Aetius, 403; captured by treachery (462), 415; Athaulf established at, 110 f.; Lodève dependent on, 408 f. *See* Hilary, Rusticus
Narses, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 363 ?): grandson of Jousik and great-grandson of Gregory the Illuminator, 371 f.; brought up at Cæsarea, 372; consecration by Basil, 372; story of the dove, 372; reforms and charities, 372 f.; assassinated by King Pap, 371, 373; his son Sahag, 371, 375
Natale, 19, 459, 462. *See* Anniversary
Nathyr, Bp. of Pharan (*saec.* v.), 395
Nationality in Church organization, 370, 396
Nativity, Grotto of the, 11, 33
Nature. *See* Christology
Navy: of Stilicho, 85; of Genseric, 432, 435, 446 f.; Corsican timber for Huneric's, 441; Ricimer's, 447
Nazianzus, 224, 227. *See* Gregory
Nebuchadnezzar, 434
Nectarius, Bp. of Avignon (*c.* 439-51), 411
Nectarius, Bp. of Constantinople (381-98): successor of Gregory Nazianzen, 28; Evagrius and, 28; his brother Arsacius, 69; death, 51; character, 52
Nedjed, 396
Nedjef, 394
Nehardea, 380
Nennius, 189
Neo-cæsarea: Council (315), 19; canons, 387
Neophytes, 5, 68, 427 f., 443
Neoplatonism: Victorinus and, 85; theurgic, 351
Neoplatonists: Augustine and, 85; Hypatia, 203, 210; Porphyry, 43, 278; Synesius, 203 f.

Nephalius, monk of Alexandria (*saec.* v.), 351
Nepotianus († 396), correspondent of Jerome, 132
Nervii, 117
Nestorian, Nestorians: after the Council of Ephesus (431), 258, 266 f.; "Simonians," 267; in the East, 285, 391; in Persia, 313
as term of abuse, viii., 307; Dioscorus and "Nestorianizers" at *Latrocinium*, 288; "Nestorians" support legates at Chalcedon, 308; Chalcedonians viewed as "Nestorians" by Monophysites, 310, 324, 341 f.; Theodoret and the Easterns at Chalcedon as "Nestorians," 313
Nestorianism: influence of Diodore and Theodore on Nestorius, 268; Theodoret as "Master" of Nestorius, 300; teaching compared with that of Paul of Samosata, 228 ff., 235, 284. Nestorius on *Theotokos*, 227 f., 238, 253; his theological statements, 245, 268, 309, 352. What was Nestorianism really? 235, 312 f. Nestorius' own view of it, 311 f.; his view of the Tome of Leo, 312 f., 314; Dioscorus and Tome of Leo, 298, 331; Greek view of the Tome, 317, 324
Letter of Archdeacon Leo to Cassian, 196, 230; Cassian *de Incarnatione*, 228, 230; the *Praedestinatus* on, 198; letter of Eutyches to Pope Leo against, 279; Pope Leo on, 457
in the creed of Rufinus "of Palestine," 146; in creed of Philadelphia, 250; Nestorianism or teaching of Diodore and Theodore in the East? 390; attitude of School of the Persians, 390 f.; position in Persia, 393; in Armenia, 268, 391; decline at Antioch, 343 f.; condemned in the Henotikon, 348 f.
Nestorius, Bp. of Constantinople (428-31) Chap. x. *passim*: priest and monk of Antioch, 220; character and eloquence, 220, 231, 258, 267; elected successor to Sisinnius, 220; vigour against heretics, 220 f., 242, 250; upholds preaching of Anastasius, 228; his own sermons and homilies, 220, 228 f., 232, 234 f., 238, 245, 268; attacked by Eusebius the pleader, 228, 280; and by Cassian, 198, 228, 230, 235; opposition of monks, 24, 216, 228 f.; unwise treatment, 229, 239; patronizes Pelagian bishops at Constantinople, 229; letters to Pope Celestine about them, 229; accuses opponents of Apollinarianism and Arianism, 229; attitude of Pope
Nestorius—*continued*
Celestine to his teaching, 230, 233 f.; Nestorius and Cyril as theologians, 231 f.; Cyril's letter to Nitrian monks, 232; and to him, 232, 302; his reply, 233; the case of Philip, 233
Cyril's "Dogmatic Letter" to Nestorius, 233, 245, 295, 302; his reply, 233, 245; Cyril's opinion of him, 233 f. Teaching of Dorotheus, 234, 237. Cyril "against the blasphemies of Nestorius," 234. Teaching of Nestorius condemned at Rome (430), 234 f., 243. His opinion of Pope Celestine, 235
The Court and Nestorius, 236, 276. Project of a Council, 236. Cyril cites Nestorius, 237; the proposals for Anathema, 237. Attitude of John of Antioch, 237 f., *cf.* 314; letter to Nestorius, 212, 238. Attitude of Acacius of Berœa, 237 f. Nestorius' reply to John, 238. His counter-anathemas, 239
Nestorius at Ephesus (431), 240; his supporters, 240, 244; Count Irenæus, 240, 275, 296. Schnoudi and Nestorius, 240, 310 f., 315. Treatment by Cyril and Memnon of Ephesus, 242. Cyril summons Nestorius, 244; protests made against opening of Council, 244; Nestorius cited and deposed, 245 f., 339; sentence confirmed by papal legates on arrival, 248; attitude of Nestorius, 248; sentence accepted by the government, 251, 255; imperial efforts at conciliation, 251 f. The Easterns and Nestorius, 249, 251; attitude of Dalmatius and monks of Constantinople, 252 f.; and of monks of Chalcedon, 254; resignation of Nestorius, 253, 255
Nestorius sent to Antioch, 253; objection of Pope Celestine (432), 257, 267. Consecration of Maximian as successor, 254; approval of Celestine, 257, 461. Further imperial efforts, 259 f.; attitude of Acacius of Berœa, 260, and of Theodoret and Andrew of Samosata, 261. Nestorius demands restoration, 263, 267. Deposition recognized by Easterns, 263, 276; feeling in Cilicia and Euphratesiana, 265 f. His removal asked for by Bp. John (*c.* 435), 267
Nestorius in exile, 267, 272, 276; at Petra in Idumæa, 267, and Oasis of Ibis, 267, 310, 343. His writings and followers proscribed, 267. Position of his friends after Formula of Union (433), 272 f., 276; renewal of proscription of writings and sup-

Nestorius—*continued*
porters (448), 278; his condemnation renewed at Chalcedon (451), 316. Nestorius and Dioscorus, 296, 311, and Tome of Leo, 312 f., 314. Treated as a heretic by Egyptians at Chalcedon, 304, and by Eutychian monks of Constantinople, 306; anathematized by Ibas of Edessa, 309; ambiguous attitude of Theodoret, 300, 309. Nestorius captured by Nobades, 310
Nestorius at Panopolis, 310; at Elephantine, 311; at Panopolis again and desert, 311; his *Apology*, 311 f.; moved to fortress at Panopolis, 314; illness and death (454), 314 f.; Monophysite story of his death, 315
Nicæa: confinement of Chrysostom at, 69; position in relation to Constantinople, 320; project for Council at (451), 297 f.
Council (325): imposes *Homoousios*, 313; treatment of vanquished party, 308; general acceptance by time of Theodosius I., 56; Rufinus edits Origen to fit it, 37; belauded by Martyrius of Jerusalem, 353; its effect on organization, 18, 22, 179, 318, 386, 465. Roman text of canons, 170 ff., 175, 179, 321, 323. *See* Canons, Creeds
Alexander of Thessalonica at, 126; Aristaces of Armenia, 371; Bp. of Pityus, 360 f.; Bp. of Bosphorus, 361; Caecilian of Carthage, 172; Persian bishop at, 381
Nicander the Stylite (*saec.* v. ?), 217
Nicephorus Callistus, historian (*saec.* xiv.), 358
Nicetas, Bp. of Aquileia (*c.* 458), 21
Nicetas, Bp. of Remesiana (*c.* 398), 127
Nicomachus Flavianus, Vicarius (*c.* 392), 81
Nicomedia: as seat of government, 56; proposed meeting of John of Antioch and Cyril at, 259, 265; threat of exile to, 265; position relative to Constantinople, 320. *See* Eusebius, Himerius
Nicomedia, Gulf of, 64
Nicopolis, 125. *See* Atticus, Theodotus
Nicopsis, 360 f.
Niebelungs, 402
Nile, 240, 310
Nilus the Sinaite (*saec.* iv.), his history and writings, 205 f., 217; objection to idle monks, 214; admiration of Chrysostom, 206
Nîmes, 407, 417. *See* Crocus
Nina, Christian captive in Iberia 361
Nineveh, 213, 362, 380 f. *See* Isaac
Ninian, St (*c.* 360-432 ?), 427
Nisch, 123, 127
Nischapour, 377
Nisibis: Roman stronghold (*saec.* iii.), 364; school of Persians at, 273; siege of Nisibis, 382; lost to Romans (363), 273, 365, 381; missionaries to Armenia from, 370; province, 381, 386; again added to Empire, 386. *See* Barsumas, James
Nitria, 155: deserts of, 38, 41, 191, 232; the cells, 29; valley in diocese of Bp. Dioscorus, 40; visit of Theophilus of Alexandria, 40 f.
Monks of: not all Origenists, 30; anthropomorphism in, 38, 40; Theophilus suppresses Origenists, 40, 57, 210; consequent migrations to Palestine, 41; and to Constantinople, 42, 55, 58, 60; some return, 42; letters of Theophilus, 41; supporters of Cyril, 210; his letter against Nestorius, 232; Evagrius among, 28 f.; Palladius and *Lausiac History*, 29; Isidore, 38 f.; his means, 41; Tall Brothers, 39 ff.; Cassian, 191; books of monks, 41; writings, 29
Nobades, 310, 400
Nocera, 21. *See* Felix
Noetus, heretic (*c.* 200), 341
Nola, 118; tomb of St Felix (*saec.* iii.), 114 ff.; Nicetas of Remesiana at (398, 402), 127; Melania the elder at (402), 133; Pinianus and Melania the younger at (408), 135; Pelagianism at, 164, 168, 183. *See* Paulinus, Theresa
Nomads, 78, 394 ff.
Nonnus, Bp. of Edessa (449-51), 392
Noricum, 120, 124
Nor-khalakh, 364
Northampton, 426
Notaries, 17, 65, 96, 259, 268, 287, 290
Novara, 128. *See* Gaudentius
Novatians: system, 7, 453; persecution by Nestorius, 221, 250; at Rome, 453 f.; at Constantinople, 202, 453
Novatus, African bishop, exiled (437), 433
Novellae, 411, 456
Nubel the Moor († 372), 80, 82
Numidia: Urbanists in, 80; Donatist supremacy, 81, 91; terror inspired by Optatus of Thamugad, 83; Circumcellions, *q.v.*; survival of Donatism to Arab invasion, 103; Vandals in (430), 195; acquisitions of Genseric (442), 432; restoration of Western Numidia to Empire, 435. *See also* Optatus of Thamugad
Provincial organization: presiding bishop (*decanus*), 177, *cf.* 463 f.; Council and Donatists, 101; and Pelagians, 157; represented at Council

Numidia—*continued*
of Carthage (418) by Augustine of Hippo and Alypius of Thagaste, 166. *See* Councils, Optatus of Milevis
Nymphios, 365
Nyssa, 212, 224. *See* Gregory, Heraclidas

Oak, The. *See* Councils
Oasis: Great, 267, 352. *See also* Ibis, Merv, Pharan
Oaths, 441
Obadian, Arab chief (*saec.* iv.), 395
Oceanus, priest, (*fl. c.* 383-411), friend of Rufinus, 37; Anti-Origenist, 37, 42; friend of Jerome, 42 ff., 131 f.; his letter to, 44; the suppressed letter, 42
Octogonium, 338
Odenath of Palmyra (*c.* 261), 364
Odissus, great-grandfather of St Patrick, 426
Odoacer, German leader, 448: enters Pavia (476), and Ravenna, 449; treatment of Romulus Augustulus, 449; Sidonius' view of, 418; his government, 448, 450, 467; slain and replaced by Theodoric the Amal (493), 450
Offices: at shrines, 11; monks and, 26, 58; Hours, 5, 7, 114; Vigils, 7, 119, 127; Arian Vigils at Constantinople, 53
Oil, 11
Olives, Mount of: monasteries of, 30, 34 [44, 133, 207], 324 f.
Olybrius, Emp. (472): member of the Anician family, 446, 449; husband of Placidia, daughter of Valentinian III., 446, 449; advent and fall, 449
Olybrius, son of Anicius Probus († 410): husband of Juliana, 140; death, 140
Olympias, matron at Constantinople, 58, *cf.* 69
Olympias, deaconess at Constantinople (*c.* 368-408 †), 69, *cf.* 58
Olympic games: at Daphne, 70; projected renewal at Chalcedon, 216
Olympiodorus, historian (*saec.* v.), 121, 136
Olympius, Master of the Offices (*c.* 408), friend of Augustine, 94; replaced, 94
Olympus, 9
Optatus, Bp. of Biskra (*c.* 418), 168
Optatus, Bp. of Milevis (*saec.* iv.), 81; on the Donatists, 76 f., 79
Optatus, Donatist, Bp. of Thamugad (*saec.* v.): Gildonian, 82, 88; brutality, 82 f.; his Circumcellions, 84; arrest and death, 85
Orange, Council of (441), 408
Orders, Ordination, 325; problems as to, submitted to Rome, 20, 127; monks excluded from, at Rome, 26; irregular, 123; purchase of, 55; qualification for, 89; outside diocese, 33, 59; mutilation to escape, 39; Donatist view of Catholic, 77; legislation against heretical, 92; validity of heretical, 123 f., 127; ordination to escape death, 110, 447, 449; forcible, 33 f., 141, 342; of Daniel the Stylite, 344; of deacon as bishop, 346; St Patrick, 427; of Maximus, 250
Orestes, Augustal Prefect of Egypt (*c.* 415): relations with Cyril, 209 f.
Orestes, Patrician (*saec.* v.): overthrows Julius Nepos (475), 449; captured and slain by Odoacer (476), 449
Orient, 299, 342 f., 351, 357, 371, 409. *See* Diocese
Origen (*c.* 185-253), Chap. ii. *passim*, 436; centre of controversy, 27; gnosticism of, 13; doctrines, 28; reasons for popularity, 28 ff.; Didymus the Blind and Gregory of Nyssa, 28; orthodox users of, 28 ff. (*see especially* Jerome, Rufinus), hostility of Epiphanius, *q.v.*; attitude of Aterbius, 30 f.; of John of Jerusalem, 31 f., 34; of Theophilus of Alexandria, *q.v.*; of Macarius, 36; of Eusebius of Cremona, 43; of Chrysostom, 59 f.; of Vigilantius, 119; of Augustine, 152, 163, 198; of Vincent, 198; unknown to Pope Anastasius, 38; he condemns Origen, 43, 163; "a pernicious author," 44
Apology for Origen, 36 f., 43; *Peri Archon*, 37, 42; *Homilies*, 46
Origenism: meaning of, 27 f.; little trace in Evagrius of Nitria, 29; in Egypt, 30, 38, 40 f., 55, 210; opposition in Egypt to, 32; little influence at Antioch, 60
Original Sin, 144, 149 f., 157, 163, 168, 184, 186, 192, 422, 457 f.
Orleans: siege by Attila (451), 403, 413; Council of (538), 123. *See* Annianus.
Ormuz, 399
Ormuzd, 376, 380
Orontius, Italian bishop (*c.* 418): Pelagian, 229
Orosius, Spanish priest, historian (*saec.* v.): pupil of Augustine, 137, 151, 419; *History against the Pagans*, 137, 419; on fall of Rome (410), 137, 419; on barbarians, 139; sent to Jerome by Augustine, 151 ff.; relations with John of Jerusalem, 153; with Heros and Lazarus, 154, 156; view of Pelagianism, 153, 157; *Liber Apologeticus*, 153
Osrhoene: Chereas governor, 285, 392; province, 365; capital Edessa, 365; Roman territory, 380. *See* Uranius
Ostriches, 261
Ostrogoths, 450

Otriculum, Battle of (413), 99
Ourartou, 362
Ousia, 224
Oxyrhynchus, 332

Pacomians, 30, 339
Padusia, wife of Felix, *Magister Militum* (*saec.* v.): repairs Lateran, 407
Paganism, 380: attitude of monks, 23; of Christian priests in Persia, 387; proscribed and dying (*saec.* v.), 112; Prudentius and, 114; temples at Rome closed, but unspoiled (till 410), 130 f.; in society at Rome, 131 f., 451; pagan reaction, 351; among officials, 132, 173, 259, 451; disappearance by time of Xystus III., 453; in N. Gaul and Britain, 358; in Iberia (till *saec.* iv.), 361; abolition in Armenia (*saecc.* iii.-iv.), 367, 369; paganism and Christianity, 11, 136 f., 259; in Armenia, 368-71; revival there, 373; in Caria, 351; in Persia, 380 f., 387; apostasy to, 388; of Axoumites and Homerites, 397 f.; of Saracens, 395; in Egypt, 400; among Scoti, 426-29; festivals, 11, 216, 400; Lupercalia at Rome, 451; paganism and Donatism in Africa, 81, 89; Orosius' *Against the Pagans*, 137; "pagan times," 259, 456; Slavs in Dacia, 127; Suevi, 406
Cæionius Albinus, 132; Apronianus, 134; Hypatia, 203-205, 210; Jovius, 94; Leontius of Athens and Athenais, 275; Pamprepius of Athens, 351; Nicomachus Flavianus, 81; Rechila, 404, 406; Symmachus, 173, 451; Victorinus, 85; Volusianus, 451
Painting, 12
Pakaiaridj, 369
Palestine, 38, 134, 152, 211, 316: provinces of, 319, 334; Prætorian Prefect, 34; threatened invasion by Huns, 34, 50, 132; tombs and shrines, 10 f.; Holy Places, 33, 150, 168, 406; pilgrimages to, 325, 406, 453
Episcopate of, 155, 353, 395 f.; at Ephesus (431), 240; at *Latrocinium* (449), 287; at Chalcedon (451), 298 f., 301, 303; position of Bp. of Jerusalem among, 318 f.; letter of Theophilus to bishops, 74; of Marcian to Synod of, 327. *See also* Jerusalem
Confessors in, 36; monks and Origen, 28; Origenist monks from Egypt in, 41 f.; monastic opposition to Chalcedon, 324, 325-8. *See* Monasteries
Jerome and his circle in (*see* Jerome, Melania, Rufinus); Epiphanius in, *q.v.*; Heros and Lazarus in, 154, 156, 162; Isidore in, 35, 39; Oceanus and Fabiola (395), 132; Orosius, 151, 156; death of the Paulas and Melanias, 133; Pelagius in, *q.v.*; Peter of Iberia, 332, 390; Postumianus in, 118; Timothy Aelurus in, 336; Vigilantius in, 119; fugitives from Alaric in, 136
Acceptance of Encyclical of Basiliscus, 344, 353; Monophysites of, 317, 346
Palladius, Bp. of Helenopolis (*c.* 367-431): a Galatian, 29 f.; his identity, 30, 51; author of *Lausiac History*, 29, 51; friend of Rufinus and Melania, 29; in Egypt (to 399), 29 f.; at Jerusalem, 30; Epiphanius and, 30, 34; the "Dialogue with Theodore," 39, 51, 61, 64 f., 71 f., 173; on Porphyrius of Antioch, 70; quoted, 42
Palladius, (*saec.* v.): relations with Britain, 188 f., 425, 429; relation to St Patrick, 429
Palladius, Prætorian Prefect of the Orient (*c.* 451), 299
Pallia, in Gaul, 409
Pallium: of Theophilus of Alexandria, 40; of Acacius of Constantinople, 359; sent to bishops from Rome as mark of distinction, 464
Palmyra, 213, 364, 395
Pammachius (*fl. c.* 385-409): senator at Rome, 131; ascetic, 5; his family, 131; founds home for poor travellers, 132; Anti-Origenist, 37, 42; relations with Rufinus, 37, 42, 146, and Pope Anastasius, 38; friend of Jerome, 42, 74, 136; intercepts letter to Rufinus, 42; letters of Jerome to, 42 f., 44 f., 74; death, 135 f.; his house becomes a church, 135
Pamphilus, martyr († 309): the *Apology for Origen*, 36, 43; Jerome's view of its authorship, 43
Pamphylia, monks in, 23; provinces of, 334; letter of Atticus to bishops of, 212. *See* Side
Pamprepius of Athens (*saec.* v.): theurgic Neoplatonist, 351; patronized by Illus, 351; at Papyrion, 352
Panarion. *See* Epiphanius
Panegyrics, 416
Panion, 329. *See* Priscus
Pannonia: provinces, 120, 124; barbarians in, 120, 124, 401, 413, 450
Panopolis, Nestorius at, 310 f., 314
Pantænus of Alexandria (*saecc.* ii.-iii.), 397
Panticapeum, 360
Pap, King of Armenia (*c.* 367), son of Arsaces, upheld by Emp. Valens, 373 f.; his guardian, Narses, 373; murders him, 371, 373 f.; puts forward

Faustus as Catholicos, 374; death, 374 f.; character, 374
Papa, Catholicos of Persia (*c.* 325-6), deposed, 385; restored by "Western Fathers," 385
Paphlagonia, 329, 455
Pappus, Syrian bishop (*c.* 404), removed as Johannite, 207; restored by Alexander of Antioch, 207
Papyrion, 351 f.
Para, 373
Parabolani, 16, 240, 287, 290
Parembolæ, 395 f. *See* Peter
Paris, 122, 217, 413
Parishes, 89, 274, 452
Parma, 130
Parmenian, Donatist bishop of Carthage (*c.* 350-91), 78; distinction and writings, 79; refuted by Optatus of Milevis, 79, and by Augustine, 80, 90; death (391), 82; replaced by Primianus, 82
Parschimnia, 369
Parthians, struggles with the Empire, 364; replace Seleucids at Beth-Ardaschir, 385; Christians among, 379; Rufinus on land of, 397
Pascentius, Count (*c.* 406), in controversy with Augustine, 121
Pascentius, Manichean, of Rome (*c.* 443), in Spain, 456
Paschasinus, Bp. of Lilybæum (*c.* 451): papal legate to Chalcedon, 297, 301; to preside, 297; Pope Leo's letter to, 302; pronounces sentence on Dioscorus, 303
Paschasius, Spanish Christian (*c.* 437), at Vandal Court, 436; martyred, 436
Passarion, Convent of, 324
Passibility, 268, 278
Pastor, Galician bishop (*c.* 433), 405
Patriarchs, 318, 381
Patriarchs, Jewish, Court of, 14
Patricians, 299. In the East: Eutropius, 50; Aetius, *q.v.*; Florentius, 280, 283; Anatolius, 299; Aspar, 334, 337; Zeno, 337; Illus, 347, 351. In the West: Constantius, *q.v.*; Sidonius Apollinaris, 418; Ricimer, *q.v.*; Gondebaud the Burgundian, 449; Orestes, 449
Patrick, St, 423; Apostle of Ireland, 425 f.; early history, 426; missionary work, 426 f.; date, 428 f.; relation to Palladius, 429; writings, 426, 427 f.; style, 428
Patrimony: of the Church, 17; of the poor, 408
Patroclus, Bp. of Arles (412-26): in succession to Heros, 160; attitude to Heros, 162; relations with Pope Zosimus, 160 ff., 257; granted enlarged jurisdiction, 161, 410; Pope Leo's view of it, 410; relation of Pope Boniface to him, 175, and of Placidia, 187; appeals to Rome under, 408; assassination (426), 407, 409; character, 160, 408, 422; succeeded by Honoratus, 407
Paul, St, conversion of, 192; theology of, 13; St Augustine and, 143, 152, 192; Pelagius on, 147 ff.; Jerome on St Paul and St Peter, 152; Origen on, 152; *Natale* of, 459. *See also* Basilicas
Paul, Bp. of Emesa (*c.* 431-3): confidant of Acacius of Berœa, 262; represents him at Ephesus, 262; sent by John of Antioch to Alexandria, 262; reception by Cyril, 262 f.; Paul's view of his authority, 263; return to Syria, 263; new journey to Cyril with terms of reconciliation, 264
Paul, Bp. of Ephesus (*c.* 476), 339
Paul of Samosata, Bp. of Antioch (260-70), 27; adoptionism of, 123, 226, 230, 235; relation of Bonosus to, 123, and of Nestorius, 228 f., 235, 284, 312, and of Leporius, 230, 235; dislike of (*saecc.* iii., iv.), 341; Aphraates not influenced by the controversy, 380 f.; Dionysius of Alexandria and, 328
Paula, St, wife of Toxotius (*fl. c.* 385-404): friend of Jerome, 30, 131, 133, and of Epiphanius, 30; mother of Paulina, 131, and of Toxotius, 132; example of asceticism, 112; death (404), 133; grandchildren, 132, 207. *See* Paula the younger
Paula the younger (*fl. c.* 401-16), daughter of Læta and Toxotius, 132; Jerome's scheme for education, 133; at Bethlehem, 155; letter to Pope Innocent, 156; at death of Jerome (420), 207
Paulicians, 213
Paulina, daughter of Paula (*fl. c.* 385-97): wife of Pammachius, 131 f.
Paulinian, brother of Jerome (*fl. c.* 385-402), forcibly ordained by Epiphanius, 33 f.; attitude of John of Jerusalem, 33 f.; settlement, 36
Paulinus (353-431), Bp. of Nola (*c.* 409-31): early history and education, 114, 116; pupil of Ausonius, 114 f.; consul (*æt.* 25), 114; Consularis of Campania, 114; baptism (390), 114; husband of Theresa, 43, 114; desire for retirement, 5, 115, 190, 419; ordained priest (393) at Barcelona, 114, 141; settlement at Nola, 115; elected Bp. of Nola (*c.* 409), 135, 404; advent of Goths, 135; alarm of Augustine at influence of Pelagius on, 164, 168, 183; attitude of Placidia

Paulinus—*continued*
to, 175; Sidonius Apollinaris on, 419; his fame, 115, 175
Letters, 117, 119, 146; epithalamium, 182
List of friends, 117; Rufinus, 43; Sulpicius Severus, 116, 118; visit of Vigilantius, 119; Nicetas of Remesiana, 127; Melania the elder, 133; Pinianus and Melania the younger, 135; Marcellinus, 146; Pelagius, 164; Bp. Memor, 182
Paulinus, deacon of Milan (*c.* 412), deacon of St Ambrose, 148; administration of African property of Church of Milan, 148; accuser of Celestius, 148, 163; summoned to Rome, 164
Paulinus of Pella (*saec.* v.): *Eucharisticon*, 138; on invasion of Gaul, 138
Pausianus, Bp. of Hypata (*c.* 431): at Council of Ephesus, 250
Pavia, 413, 416, 449. *See* Epiphanius
Pedius, 138
Pegasius, Bp. of Périgueux (*saec.* v.): friend of Paulinus of Nola, 117
Pehlvi, 381
Pekin, 384
Pelagianism, spread of, 146; in Britain, 188 ff., 425 (*see* Pelagius); in Ireland, 189, 425; survival in N. Italy and Dalmatia, 457
Nestorius and, 229, 231, 234; Cyril of Alexandria and, 185; modification in Cassian, 266; and Faustus of Riez, 191 f., 266, 422; misuse of term "semi-pelagian" as to Provence, 191; Marius Mercator and, 147, 185, 231, 284; Popes Leo and Gelasius on, 457; relation to Stoicism, 183
Pelagians: at Carthage, 150; in Sicily, 150, 182, 188; opposed by Augustine, *q.v.*, and Jerome, *q.v.*; authorship of *Hypomnesticon*, 200, 457; attacks on Jerome, 206; attitude of government, 181, 187; deposition of Julian (418), *q.v.*; attitude of Atticus of Constantinople (*see* Atticus); question of, at Council of Ephesus (431), 249; in Aquileia, 181, 457; Venetia, Dalmatia, 457; literary work of concealed Pelagians, 198 f.
Pelagius (*saec.* v.), Chap. vi. *passim*: early history, 145; British monk, 131, 145, 147, 152, 157, 168, 193, 420; Jerome on "the Scot," 145, 151; knowledge of Greek, 145, 149; life at Rome (*c.* 400-10), 145; Roman friends, 131, 168; Marcellinus, 146; Rufinus of Syria, 146; austerity, 146; relations with Celestius, 142, 147 f., 153 f.; in Africa (*c.* 411), 142, 147; at Carthage, 147; in Palestine, 141, 147, 150;
Pelagius—*continued*
relations with Augustine, *q.v.*; prominence at Jerusalem, 150; relations with John of Jerusalem, 150, 153; Jerome and, 150 f., 155 f.; pupils Timasius and James, 152; their "conversion," 152; Orosius and, 151 ff.; Heros and Lazarus and, 154, 156 f., 162; the Synod of Diospolis (415), 154; acquittal of Pelagius, 154 f.; Annianus of Celeda as his secretary, 206; Pope Innocent and, 157 f., 162 f., 199; letter of Pelagius to, 163; Zosimus and, 157, 163 ff.; Zosimus praises Pelagius, 164; Xystus and, 157, 168 f., 193, 197; Pelagius and Paulinus of Nola, 164, 168; attitude of the Patrician Constantius to, 166; and of Galla Placidia, 166, 187; imperial order for his expulsion from "Rome," 167; his condemnation by Zosimus, 167, 181, 183, 249; excluded by a Council from the Holy Places, 168; forcible measures of Government of Ravenna, 181; Roman divisions, 174; attitude of Cyril, 185; and of author of the *Praedestinatus*, 198; disappearance of Pelagius, 168, 181
Theology, 143 ff., 147, 149, 153, 163 f., 168, 182; possible influence of teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 146; its attraction, 143 f., 146; relation to that of Celestius, 148, 153 f.; relation of Julian of Eclanum to, 182 f., 184 f.; Faustus of Riez on, 420 ff.; Sulpicius Severus and, 188
Writings: treatise *On the Trinity*, 146; *Liber Capitulorum*, 146; *Commentary on St Paul*, 147 ff.; *De Natura*, 152; its quotations, 152; *On Free Will*, 163; Letter to Pope Innocent, 163; Letter to Demetrias (414), 141, 150 f.; doubtful authorship of Letter to Livania, 151, and *De induratione cordis Pharaonis*, 147
Pelagius, Roman deacon (*saec.* vi.): work against condemnation of the Three Chapters, 241, 270
Peloponnese, 125, 432; solitudes of, 190
Pelusium. *See* Eusebius, Isidore
Penitence, 350, 395; discipline, 6, 132, 409; results of its rigour, 6 f.; exclusion from clergy, 6, 89; problems of, 20; alleged severity of Hilary of Arles, 409; attitude of Novatians, 7, 453
Penitents: bishop and, 6; laity and absolution of, 15; form of reconciliation, 89; Fabiola among the, 132; Manicheans as, 455 f.
Pension, 309, 340
Pentadia, deaconess at Constantinople (*c.* 404), 69

Pentapolis, 348
Pentecost, 69
Pera, 219
Perga, 212; Synod of (*saec.* v.), 334 f. *See* Beronician
Pergamius, Prefect of Egypt (*c.* 482), 348
Périgueux, 117, 417. *See* Pegasius
Perjury, 354
Perkischo, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 429), 376
Peroz, King of Persia (457-84): shows favour to Christians, "satraps" of Armenia, 377; treatment of Kiud, 378; revolt of Iberians, 378; persecution, 389; imprisons Babowai, 389 f.
Perpetua, St († *c.* 202-3), 433
Persarmenia, 268, 376
Persecution: of Origenists by Theophilus of Alexandria, 39 f., 55, 59; of Johannites, 69, 72 f.; of Donatists, 76; by Donatists, 77, 81 ff., 84, 91 f., 94, 341; of St Britius by disciples of St Martin, 116 f.; of heretics by Nestorius, 220 f.; of Nestorians by government, 267 f., 278; of Monophysites, 341; by Monophysites, 341 f., 392; in Armenia, 368 f., 391; in Persia, 274, 379, 382-4, 387 f., 389 f.; by Vandals in Africa, 430-44; in Sicily, 122
Persecutors, death of, 443
Perseverance, 194 f., 200
Persia: religious and political expansion under Sassanids, 364, 369 f.; capture of Hatra, 394; frontier problems and the Empire, v.; acquisitions of Diocletian (297), 365, 382; conflict from Constantius to Julian (363), 372, 382; relations with Empire under Jovian (363), 365, under Valens, 365, 373 f., 382, under Theodosius I. (*c.* 387), 365, 375, 382; partition of Armenia, 361, 365, 375 f.; Persian Armenia, 268, 365, 376; relations under Theodosius II., 202, 220, 388
Ardaschir (226-41), 394; Sapor I. (241-72), 394; Sapor II. (309-379), 365, 378 f., 382; Sapor III. (383-8), 386; Jazdgerd I. (399-420), 387 f.; Bahrâm V. (420-38), 376, 388; Jazdgerd II. (438-57), 376, 389; Peroz (457-84), 377 f., 389 f.; Balasch (484-8), 378
Jewish Colonies in 380 f.; organization of Iranian Mazdæism, 376 ff., 379 ff., 387, 394; Nestorius and the Persians, 220; fame of Simeon Stylites, 217, and of Theodoret, 274; Magi (*q.v.*)
History of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, 384 f.; of Aschdischad and Etchmiadzin, 368, 375; of Susiana, 382, 384; of Nisibis, *q.v.*
Persia—*continued*
Church of Persia, 273, 396; Origin of Christianity from Edessa, 379; story of St Maris († 82), *q.v.*; Tatian (*saec.* ii.), a Christian in Persian Empire, 379; Christianity in *saec.* iii., the "Laws of the Countries," 379; Constantine and Persian Christians, 378 f.; difficulties of Bp. Papa (*saec.* iv.), 385; John, a Persian bishop at Nicæa (325), 381; a learned bishop at Dedication of Holy Sepulchre (335), 381; organization of the Church, "Sons of the Alliance," 380; liturgical language, 381; provincial organization, 381; position of the Catholicos, 389; career of Simon Barsabæus, Bp. of Seleucia (326-41), 382 f., 385, martyred (341), 383; Schahdost, bishop (341-2), martyred, 383; Barbaschemin, bishop (342-6), martyred, 383; vacancy of twenty years, 383; Aphraates, Bp. of Adiabene (*fl.* 336-45), his teachings, 380 f., 384; on condition of the Church (344), 385; lists of martyrs, 384; activities of Marutas of Maipherqat, 386 f.; Isaac, Bp. of Seleucia (399-410), 387; Council of Seleucia (410), 386 f.; acceptance of Creed and Canons of Nicæa, 386; Jahbalaha, Bp. of Seleucia (415-20), at Constantinople, 387; visit of Acacius of Amida (420), 387; Council of Seleucia (420), acceptance of further canons, 387; persecution under Bahrâm V., 388; Dadiso, Bp. of Seleucia (*c.* 421-56), troubles, 388 f.; Council of Maktaba (422 ?), forbids reference of disputes to Western Fathers, 389, 391; martyrdoms under Jazdgerd II., 389; Babowai, Bp. of Seleucia (457-84), imprisoned, set free (464), executed (484), 389 f.; separation from West, 389; no Persian bishop at Ephesus or Chalcedon, 390; neither Council recognized, 393; Acacius, Bp. of Seleucia (*c.* 485-95 ?), 392 f.; definition of faith, 392; little influence of Nestorius, 313, 393; colonies on coast of Hindustan, 400
Persian Gulf, 362, 394, 399 f.
Persians: and Armenians, 363, 369, 373, 377 f.; and Romans, 372, 375, 382
Persians, School of the: at Nisibis, 273; at Edessa, its activities and importance, 273, 390 f.; theological interest, 273, 390; closed, 391; Acacius and Barsumas, 393
Person, Persons: of the Trinity, 224 f.; of Christ, view of Leporius, 230;

Two Persons not Nestorian, 312; Person and Nature, 245. *See also* Christology
Pestilence, 413
Peter, St: position in the Apostolic College, 389, 459; See of St Peter, 322; his two Sees, 208, 352; Origen, Jerome, Augustine on St Peter and St Paul, 152; Council of Chalcedon and, 304; legendary journey, 360. *See also* Basilica, Churches
Peter, Bp. of Alexandria (373-80): puts forward Maximus for Bp. of Constantinople, 58
Peter, Bp. of *Parembolae* (*c.* 431): the Sheikh Aspebaetos, 396; his history, *ibid.*, at Council of Ephesus (431), 396
Peter Chrysologus, Bp. of Ravenna (*c.* 450): eloquence, 284; correspondence with Eutyches, 284
Peter the Fuller, Bp. of Antioch (471-88): former Acœmete, priest of Chalcedon, 342; Monophysite, 342, 352; installed in place of Martyrius at Antioch, 342; protected by Zeno, 342; withdrawal and second restoration, 342; exiled, 342 f.; in custody of Acœmetes, 343; restored to Antioch (475), 343; again exiled, 343; fourth installation at Antioch, 352; accepts Henotikon, 352; a great liturgist, 352; places Nicene Creed in the liturgy, 352; treatment of the Trisagion, 352; relations with John Codonatus, 343, 357
Peter of Iberia, Bp. of Maiouma (*c.* 452): Nabarnougi, son of King Bosmari, 325; early career, 325, 361; at Constantinople (422), Jerusalem (430), monk, friend of Melania the younger, 325; at Gaza (438), 325 f.; ordained priest (447), 325; hostile to Chalcedon, 325 f.; consecrated Bp. of Maiouma by Theodosius of Jerusalem (452), 326, 390; escapes from police, 327; in exile at Alexandria, 332; at Oxyrhynchus, 332; consecrates Timothy Aelurus Bp. of Alexandria (457), 331 f., 390 f.; left in charge by Timothy, 337; wanderings in Syria, 353; refuses to accept Henotikon, 353, 390 f.; death (488), 354; Life by Zacharias the Rhetor, 325, 354; another Life, 317, 328, 331; succeeded by John of Beth Rufin, 317
Peter Mongus, Monophysite, Bp. of Alexandria (477-90): deacon of Dioscorus at *Latrocinium* (449), 293, 330; Cyrillian, deposed by Proterius, 330; still deacon, consecrated Bp. of Alexandria (477), by Theodore of Antinoe, 346; buries Aelurus and disappears, 346; still at Alexandria, 347; attitude of Pope Simplicius to, 354; accepts Henotikon (482) and is recognized, 348 f.; his policy, 349 ff.; letter of Council of Antioch to (*c.* 382 ?), 353; his name placed on diptychs by Acacius of Constantinople, 355; attitude of Pope Felix III. to, 356; character, 350 f., 354; alleged attack on Flavian, 293
Peter Illyrian, priest at Rome (*saec.* v.): builds Basilica of St Sabina on the Aventine, 452
Peter, reader of Alexandria: murders Hypatia (415), 210
Pethion, missionary in Media (*saec.* v.), martyr, 389
Petilian, Donatist, Bp. of Constantina (*c.* 400): at Conference (411), 96; character, 96 f.; works of, 97; treatise of Augustine against, 90
Petra, 267, 395
Petronius Maximus, Emp. (455): member of the Anician family, 445; rival of Aetius, 445 f.; succeeds Valentinian III., 415, 446; marries Eudoxia, wife of Valentinian, 446; perishes in a rising, 415, 446
Phanagoria, 360
Pharan, Oasis of, 395. *See also* Nathyr
Pharen, Abp. of Armenia (*c.* 336), 372
Pharaoh, 206, 434; Bp. of Alexandria as the ecclesiastical Pharaoh, 57 f., 256, 272. *See also* Alexandria
Pharbe. *See* Lazarus
Phasis: river, 362; plain of, 361
Phials, 11
Philadelphia, 250. *See* Theophanes
Philæ, 400
Philastrius, Bp. of Brescia (*c.* 381-96 ?), 128
Philip, Roman priest (*saec.* v.): of the "Church of the Apostles" at Rome, 248, 452; legate of Pope Zosimus to Africa (418), 170; at Council of Carthage (419), 175 f.; legate of Pope Celestine to Ephesus (431), 170, 248, 452; summoned by Theodosius II. to Chalcedon, 253; present at consecration of Maximian at Constantinople (431), 254, 452; secures restoration of his church by Theodosius II. and family, 452; inscription, 452
Philip of Side, priest of Constantinople (*saec.* v.): candidate for succession to Bp. Atticus (425), 219; to Sisinnius (427), 220; holds schismatic assemblies, 233; accused by Celestius of Manicheanism and deposed, 233; candidate for succession to Nestorius (431), 254; relations with Cyril, 260

Philip, priest (*c.* 430): relations with Cyril, 260. *See* Philip *supra*
Philippi. *See* Flavian
Philoponi, 5
Philoponus. *See* John
Philosophy, 13. *See* Metrodorus, Sextus, Neoplatonism
Philostorgius, historian (*fl. c.* 368-425), 51, 399
Philotheus, "Macedonian," (*c.* 467), 458
Philoxenus, 392. *See* Xenaias
Phœnicia, 395: missions in, 70; provinces, 261, 319; of Phœnicia Secunda, 251; pretensions of Jerusalem as to, 251; assigned to Antioch, 319
Photinus, Bp. of Sirmium (*saec.* iv.): his Adoptionism condemned, 123, 226; followers in Illyrian provinces and Italy (*saec.* iv.), 122; doctrine of Nestorius identified with, 230, 312; of Bonosiaci in Gaul and Spain (*saec.* v.), 123 f.
Photinus, Macedonian bishop (*c.* 414): condemned by Pope Anastasius, restored by Pope Innocent, 127
Photius, Bp. of Constantinople (857-91): preserves knowledge of Acts of Synod of the Oak (403), 64; history of Olympiodorus (*saec.* v.), 121, 136; work of Theodore Mops., 185; Acts of Council of Ephesus (431), 212 f.; John Philoponus against Council of Chalcedon, 311; letters of Varadatus and Simeon, 335; work of Basil the Cilician, 358
Photius, Bp. of Tyre (448-57?): succeeds Irenæus, 279; tries Ibas of Edessa, 283
Photius, priest of Constantinople (*c.* 429-32): Nestorian, 232, 250; banished to Petra, 267
Phrygia, 10, 215, 395; Goths in, 50; provinces of, 334. *See* Laodicea, Synaos
Physician, 121, 252
Physis, 185, 224, 277, 280. *See* Nature
Piacenza, 129. *See* Placentia
Picenum, 170, 297, 457
Picts, 423, 427 f.
Pictures: in churches, 12; of Christ, 12, 34; of Simeon Stylites, 217
Pilgrimages, 113, 115, 118, 132, 406
Pilgrims, 10 f., 325, 453
Pincian Hill, 131
Pinciana, Domus, 142
Pindar: Prudentius compared with, 114
Pinianus († 431-2?): of the Valerii Severi, 133; husband of Melania the younger, 133; home on the Caelian Hill, 168, 207; hospitality to Johannite bishops, 74, 135; desire for retirement from world, 5, 134; opposition of Publicola, 134; disposal of vast property, 134 f., 141 f.; at death-bed of Rufinus (410), 136; Augustine and, 141 f., 168; people of Hippo demand his ordination as priest, 141 f.; arrival in poverty at Jerusalem, 142, 168; at death-bed of Jerome (420), 207; death, 325
Pirates: exterminated by Pompey, 337; of the Caucasus in the Black Sea, 360; Herulian, 406; Saxon at mouth of Loire, 414; Danish, 423; of Coroticus, 427; Vandal at Carthage, 432, 447; at Rome, 446
Pistus, Anti-Pope of Alexandria (339), 56
Pityus, Pizunda, 73, 343, 360
Placentia, 447. *See* Piacenza
Places, Holy. *See* Holy Places
Placidia: Palace of, 61. *See* Galla
Placidia the younger (*saec.* v.): daughter of Valentinian III. and Eudoxia, 432; sister of Eudocia, 432, 447; sister-in-law of Huneric, 437; intercedes for Catholics of Africa, 437; married to Emp. Olybrius, 446, 449; carried off by Vandals, 328, 447
Planeta, 409
Plato, 85
Pleader, 228
Po, 128, 413
Podion, 138
Poetry, Christian, 90, 113 ff., 138, 141, 276, 416, 418, 420, 453, 468
Poison, 373
Poitiers. *See* Hilary
Pollentia, Battle of (402), 73, 106, *cf.* 134
Polytheism, Semitic, 397
Pompeianus, Prefect of Rome, proposes to Pope Innocent restoration of Paganism (?), 137
[Pompeianus], Pompey (106-48 B.C.), 337, 364
Pontianus, Pope (230-35), 160
Pontius, Donatist bishop (*c.* 362): petition to Julian, 76
Pontus: "Diocese" of, 241, 319, 357; extent, 320; provinces, 20, 334; Council of Constantinople (381) on, 319; jurisdiction of Constantinople, 20, 241, 321, 357; mountains, 73. *See also* Evagrius
Pontus Euxinus. *See* Euxinus
Poor: in the Empire, 2; Christians and relief of, 6, 39, 419; Pinianus and the Gospel precept, 134; relief at Rome, 466; home for poor travellers at Portus, 132; Persian clergy and poor, 384; relief of Persian prisoners, 388; Narses' hostels for poor in Armenia, 372 f.; relief organizations, 372; those of Eustathius and Basil, 372; Hilary of Arles and the "patri-

mony of the poor," 408 ; Salvian and, 419 ; register of poor at Jerusalem, 142 ; Eugenius of Carthage and, 437
Popes. *See* Rome, Church of
Porphyry, Bp. of Antioch (404-14) : consecrated successor to Flavian, 70 ; enemy of Chrysostom, 70, 73, 207 ; relations with Alexander the Messalian, 214 ; letter to the Persian bishops, 386 ; succeeded by Alexander, 207
Porphyry, Neoplatonist (232 ?-305 ?) : writings proscribed, 43, 278
Porridge, 151
Portugal, 405
Portus, 132, 449
Possidius, Bp. of Calama (400-37 ?) : friend of Augustine, 91, 96, 195, 433 ; his biographer, 157, 181, 433, 455, 466 ; beaten by Donatists, 91 ; at Augustine's death (430), 195 ; exiled by Genseric (437), 433 ; works, 455
Posters, 93, 100, 228, 245, 283, 323
Postumianus, disciple of Sulpicius Severus (*saecc.* iv., v.) : journey in the East, 118
Potentia, 170. *See* Faustinus
Potitus, grandfather of St Patrick, 426
Praedestinati, 198
Praedestinatus: Anti-Augustinian treatise, its contents and method, 198 f. ; crypto-Pelagian, 199 ; quoted, 148, 167, 455
Prænetos, 64
Præpositus sacri cubiculi, 49
Praesidius, Bp. of Sufetula (*c.* 484), 439
Prætorian Prefect, 4, 34, 95, 100, 201, 299, 456 ; as bishop, 328, 418 ; of Gaul, 187, 406 f., 411
Prætorium, 441
Prævalitana, province of, 125, 334
Prat, 386
Prayer, 144, 213 f., 361
Praylius, Bp. of Jerusalem (417-20), 163, 168
Prbt : meaning of, 442, 444
Preaching, 4 ; at Jerusalem, 8 ; of Bp. John, 31 f. ; of Epiphanius, 31 f., 60 ; of Chrysostom, 52 ff., 61, 66 f. ; of Severian of Gabala, 54, 64 ; of Gaudentius of Brescia, 128 ; of Proclus, 219 f. ; of Cyril, 209, 242, 246 ; of Simeon Stylites, 217 f. ; of Nestorius, 220, 228 f., 232 ; of Faustus of Riez, 420 ; Vandal prohibition, 437 ; of Pope Leo, 458, 468. *See* Sermons
"Claque," 209 ; shorthand notes, 65 ; abuse of preaching by priests, 196, 409
Predestination : Augustine's view of, 192 ff., 195, 198 f., 422 ; Prosper and Hilary on, 194 f., 421 ; the *Prædestinatus* (*q.v.*), 198 f. ; the deacon Leo on, 199 f. ; views in Gaul, 193, 419 ; Lucidus of Riez on, 421 ; Faustus of Riez on, 421 f.
Prefect : of Egypt (*see* Augustal Prefect) ; of Rome, 5, 137, 181, 416, 418, 451 ; of Constantinople, 215. *See also* Prætorian Prefect
Primasius, Bp. of Hadrumetum (*c.* 541), 79
Primianus, Donatist bishop of Carthage (391-411 ?) : successor of Parmenian, 82 ; deposed in a schism, 83 ; restored (393), 83 ; invokes civil power, 84 ; attitude of Catholics, 88 ; conference (403), 91 ; (411), 96
Principia, ward of Marcella (*c.* 410) : home on the Aventine, 131 ; treatment by the Goths (410), 135
Priscilla, cemetery of, 8
Priscillian, heretic (*saec.* iv.) : austerity, 18 ; collection of texts, 146
Priscillianism, Priscillianists, 212 ; no trace in Prudentius, 114 ; in Spain, 112 f., 404 f. ; effect on opinion of asceticism, 113 ; on Church life, 112, 404 f. ; summary of Doctrine by Turribius of Astorga, 405 ; censure of Pope Leo, 405
Priscus of Panion, historian (*saec.* v.), 329, 431
Prisoners, relief of, 388
Prisons : Episcopal, 229 ; civil, 326
Proba, poetess, 114 [140 f. ?]
Probus, Sextus Anicius Petronius († 394) : Prætorian Prefect, 4 ; loaded with honours, 445 ; kinsman of Ambrose, 4 ; baptism when dying, 5 ; his family tomb, 5, 131 ; house on the Pincian Hill, 131 ; members of his family, 140, 142, 151 ; widow Anicia Faltonia Proba (*see* Anicia)
Probus, Spaniard at Court of Genseric : martyred (437), 436
Processions, 11, 53, 252, 344
Proclus, Bp. of Constantinople (434-46) : secretary of Atticus, candidate for succession (425), 219 ; consecrated Bp. of Cyzicus (425), 219 ; unable to gain possession, 220, 242 ; orator and preacher, 219 f. ; candidate for succession to Sisinnius (427), 220, and to Nestorius (431), 254 ; succeeds Maximian (434), 266 ; recognized, 268 ; his Tome to the Armenians (437), 269 ; attitude to monks, 270 ; brings back body of Chrysostom (438), 271 ; recognizes Irenæus of Tyre, 275 ; encroachments in Illyria, 275 ; attitude to Juvenal of Jerusalem, 319 ; makes Thalassius Bp. of Cæsarea, 328 ; baptizes Volusianus, 451 ; death (446), 275 ; succeeded by Flavian, 275

Proconnesus, 59
Proconsul, 78, 91, 99, 290
Procopius of Cæsarea, historian (*saec.* vi.): *De Aedificiis Justiniani*, 361; *De Bello Persico*, 387; *De Bello Vandalico*, 345, 431, 434, 442, 446
Proculus, Bp. of Marseilles (*c.* 381-428), 409; and Constantine III., 117; opposes Britius, 117; makes Lazarus Bp. of Aix, 117; attempted deposition, 161 f.; brings Cassian to Marseilles, 190 f.; relations with Honoratus and Paulinus, 190; with Leporius, 230; succeeded by Venerius, 196
Projectus, Bp.: papal legate to Ephesus (431), 248; present at Constantinople at consecration of Maximian (431), 254
Promotus, general (*saec.* iv.): enemy of Rufinus, 50; dead (in 395), 50; Eudoxia, wife of Arcadius, brought up in his household, 49 f.; his widow, Marsa, 54
Prophets, 15, 325, 354
Propontis, 72
Proscription, 43, 71, 170, 212, 303, 383, 454, 457
Proselytism, 387, 397
Prosper of Aquitaine (*saec.* v.): monk of Marseilles, 194; addresses Augustine on Predestination, 194; Augustinian *sans phrase*, 194 ff., 284, 421 (*cf.* 196); defends him against Cassian's *Collationes* (*Contra Collatorem*), 193; and against Vincent of Lérins, 196; relations with Pope Celestine, 196 f., 409, 425; not mentioned in Vincent's *Commonitorium*, 198; silence after the work of the deacon Leo, 199 f., 419; study of doctrine of Incarnation, 284
Chronicle, 188 f., 199, 425, 446, 456; fragmentary, viii.; on Constantine the Vicarius, 167; contemporary account of *Latrocinium* (449) 293, 295; on death of Patroclus of Arles, 407; on Leo's call to the Papacy, 467; on Leo and Attila, 413 f.; on Palladius, 425, 429; date of Genseric's invasion of Africa, 431; on exile of Possidius, 433; on Vandal persecution, 436
Contra Collatorem, 166, 181, 187, 198, 425; *Carmen de Ingratis*, 195; other works, 195 f.; order of date, 196
Proterius, Bp. of Alexandria (451-7): Dioscorus' arch-priest left in charge (451), 329; appointed bishop, 329; riotous scenes, 329 f.; Leo dissatisfied by his statement of belief, 329 f.; deposes Timothy Aelurus and Peter Mongus, 330; treatment of Peter of Iberia, 332; consecration of Timothy Aelurus in opposition (457), 332; murder of Proterius (457), 332, 348; petitions and counter-petitions of Monophysites and Proterians, 331, 333; serious riots (458), 336; attitude of Timothy Aelurus to Proterians, 340; and of Peter Mongus, 348; name of Proterius erased from diptychs, 349
Protogenes, Bp. of Sardica (*c.* 316-43 ?), 126
Provence: sympathy with monastic ideals in, 117, 191, 418 f.; Lérins and Marseilles, 190, 418; views of Predestination in, 193 f., 200; activity of Leporius, 230; letter of Pope Celestine to bishops of, 235; saved from Visigoths, 416; bishops at Council of Arles (473-4 ?), 421; Euric master of (477), 423
Providence, 419
Provinces, 17, 412; system, 125, 129 f., 414; of Eastern Empire, 334, 343, 364 ff., 381, 386, 390, 396. Western Empire: Africa, 431 f., 464; Britain, 423 f.; Gaul, 19, 407, 409 f., 414, 421; North Italy, 129 f.; Palestine, 319, 334; Suburbicarian, 21, 212, 462 f.; Spain, 405, 466; Illyricum, 464 f.
"Provincials," date of, 465
Prudentius, poet (*fl.* 348-405), 5, 113 ff., 131
Psalms, 8, 252; Books of, 136; the *Laus perennis*, 215; Nicetas of Remesiana on Psalmody, 127
Ptolemais in Libya. *See* Synesius, Euoptius
Ptolemais in Syria. *See* Antiochus
Ptolemy, dynasty of, 57
Publicola, Valerius (†404): son of Melania the elder, husband of Albina, father of Melania the younger, 132; great wealth, 133; opposes desire of Pinianus and Melania the younger to renounce the world, 134; death (404), 134
Pulcheria, Empress (449-53): daughter of Arcadius, Augusta (at 16), 201; simplicity of life, 201 f.; letter of Cyril of Alexandria to, 236; monastic influences on, 252; doubtful attitude of Theodosius II., 252; efforts of Cyril to influence, 252, 260; marries Theodosius II. to Athenais Eudocia (421), 276; her influence supplanted by Chrysaphius (441), 276, 295; letter of Pope Leo to (449), 292; and of Valentinian III., 293; and Hilary the legate, 294; orders execution of Chrysaphius on death of Theodosius (449), 295; marries (*æt.* 51) Marcian, 295, 446; shares views of Leo and Flavian, 296; Leo's

protest after Chalcedon (451), 322; attitude of Empress Eudocia, 325; letter to monks of Palestine, 327; death (453), 331
Punic, 177
Pusaik, chief of workmen (*c.* 341), Persian martyr, 383
Puteoli. *See* Julius
Pyræum, 379, 388, 394
Pyrenees, 107, 402; barbarians cross (409), 109; Gerontius crosses (411), 110; crossed by Goths again, 111
Pythagorean, 46

Quæstor, 346
Quarries, 59
Quartodecimans, 221, 242, 250
Quicklime, 91
Quintilii, 135
Quintodecimum, 182
Quirinal, 452, 458
Quirinus, Church of, 332
Quodvultdeus, Bp. of Carthage (*c.* 438): successor of Capreolus, 433; friend of Augustine, 433; ill-treated and sent to Naples, 433; dies in Campania, 435

Rabbinical Exegesis, 380
Rabbula, Rabbulas: Bp. of Edessa (412-35): magistrate converted by Alexander the ascetic, 213; becomes bishop, 213; Cyrillian, 265, 273, 390
Racotis, 385
Radagaisus: in Italy (406), 106
Raphael, Archangel, cult of, 10
Ratiaria, 125
Ravenna, 322; transfer of government to (*c.* 404), 129; government at, 99, 358, 460; characteristics of Court, 104, 108, 115, 141, 445; policy of government—as to Goths, 110, 431, and Huns, 414 (*cf.* 412 f.); as to Pelagians, 166, 170, 181, 184; as to Eulalius, 173; as to Africa, 431 f., 435; Pope Zosimus and, 170, 172; relations with Constantinople, 203, 293; Rome and, 130, 184, 322, 412, 463
Donatists at (406), 95; execution of Stilicho at (408), 107; African delegates at (410), 94; Pope Innocent at (410), 138; Claudian at, 115, 141; Placidia established at (425), 187, 401, 445; death of Germanus of Auxerre at (448), 412; Aetius at, 412 f., 445; proclamation of Glycerius (473), 449; flight of Julius Nepos from (475), 449; Odoacer established at, 450; supplanted by Theodoric (493), 450
Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 20, 129, 322;
Ravenna—*continued*
its bishop a suffragan of Rome, 130, 463; appeal of John of Antioch to (431), 254; of Eutyches to Peter Chrysologus, 284; its bishop at Sardica, 129
Ravennius, Bp. of Arles (*c.* 449-55): priest of Hilary, succeeds him, 411 f.
Rayahs, 380, 436
Readers, 14, 16, 210, 217, 338, 342, 442, 452
Re-baptism, 77, 81, 88 f., 441
Rechiar, son of Rechila, Suevic king (448), a Catholic, 404, 406
Rechila, Suevic king († 448), pagan, 404, 406
Reconciliation: of penitents, 15, 20, 89; of heretics, 20
Red Sea, 396, 399
Reggio in Æmilia, 129
Reginus, envoy of Zeno to Africa (483), 439
Registers, municipal, 91
Relics, 11 f., 31, 118 ff., 299, 368
Religiosi, 5
Remesiana, 127. *See* Nicetas
Remigius, Master of the Offices (*c.* 365), 78
Remus, 459
Renaissance, Carolingian, 430
Renatus, priest: papal legate to *Latrocinium* (449), 287; death at Delos, 287; his importance, 288
Reparatus, Bp. of Tipasa (*c.* 481), removed by Arians, 442
Rephidim, Mt., 41
Res romana, 139, 415
Reschdouni, 377. *See* Sahag
Restitutus, Bp. of Carthage (*c.* 359): leader at Ariminum (359), 78; result, 78 f.
Restitutus, Bp. of London (*c.* 314), at Council of Arles, 424
Rew Ardaschir, 381
Rhætia, 120
Rhegium, 136
Rhetor, 275, 316, 351, *cf.* 47, 85, 108, 113
Rhine: frontier struggles with barbarians, 105 ff., 110, 112; crossed by Vandals (407), 430; Burgundians on left bank (413), 402; Attila, 413
Rhinocorura, 213. *See* Alfius
Rhodes, 240
Rhodope, 334
Rhône: regions of, 406, 412; lateness of invasion, 406; Visigoths and, 422, 450; Burgundians and, 450
Ricimer (*fl.* 456-72): Patrician, 415; defeats Avitus at Placentia (456), 447; master of Italy (456-72), 331, 415, 448, 468; Emperor-maker, 415, 435, 448, 468; stirs up Goths and Burgundians against Aegidius,

415 ; relations with Constantinople, 448 ; marries daughter of Anthemius, 448 ; sacks Rome (472), 448 ; death (472), 448 f. ; Arian, 331 ; secures toleration of Arianism, 458 ; Suevic origin, 447
Ricomer, 105
Riez, Council of (439), 408. *See* Faustus, Maximus
Riochatus, *antistes* (*saec.* v.), 420
Riothime, Riothame, British chief (*saec.* v.), 420
Riots : at Alexandria, 210, 329, 332, 336 ; at Bethlehem, 155 f. ; at Constantinople, 68 f. ; at Jerusalem, 326
Riparius, priest of Aquitaine (*saec.* v.) : Jerome and, 119, 156
Roads, 135, 426, 446, 452
Robe, christening, 442 f. *See* Baptism
Rodez, 417
Rogatists, 80 f., 83
Rogatus, Donatist bishop of Cartenna (*saec.* iv.), 80
Roman, Romans : victory over Antiochus at Magnesia (190 B.C.), 363, and Mithradates (65 B.C.), 363 ; Lucullus and Pompey in Armenia (66 B.C.), 364 ; new capital for Great Armenia, 364 ; campaigns with Parthians, 364 ; in Mesopotamia, 364 f. ; capture of Nisibis, 364 ; work of Diocletian, 365 f. ; wars with Persians, 365, 372, 375, 388 f. ; policy of Valens and Julian in the East, 373 f. ; loss of Nisibis (363), 273, 381 ; regained, 386 ; wars with Suevi, 406 ; with Vandals, 430-37 ; Romans and Vandals, 437 f., 443 ; in Vandal administration, 436 ; Romans and Ostrogoths, 450 f., and Ireland, 425
Attitude to barbarians, 107 f., 447 ; Salvian on barbarian virtues and Roman vices, 419 ; Goths as "Romans," 111 ; Scoti as "Romans" because Christians, 428 ; Armenians as clients, 364, 369 ; "friends and allies," 366, 373, 417 ; neutrality in Armenian war with Persia, 377 ; character, 354, 411, 468
Africa, provinces of, 432 (*see* Africa) ; Arabia, 396 ; Britain, *q.v.* ; Gaul, *q.v.*
Food administration, 85, 108, 432 ; Treasury, victims of, in Gaul, 402 ; merchants among Homerites, 399 ; governor ejected from Armorica, 402
Roman Army. *See* Army
Roman Empire, 375, 381, 390 : conquest by Christianity, 369, 394, *cf.* 451 ; Constantine and Persian Christians (*c.* 333), 378 f. ; Gildas and Britain, 430 ; Britain and the Empire, 188, 403, 420, 423, 430, 469 ; Christians in Roman Orient, 371 ff., 391 ;
Roman Empire—*continued*
toleration of Christians in Asia Minor and Syria, 370 ; persecution (309), 382 ; Roman sympathies of Persian Christians, 382 ; bishops of the Empire and Persia, 385 f., 389, 391 ; missionaries from, to Saba and Axoum, 397 ff. ; trade expansion in Axoum, 399 ; theological disputes in, 394, 401 ; the Church as centre of union, 417 ; its institutions and the Church, 459, 467 ; in relation to Church institutions, 3, 327
Frontiers, 104 f. ; nomads on, 78, 394 f. ; Adiabene, 379 f. ; Africa, 78 ; in Britain, 423 ; Egypt, 350, 400 ; Rhine, 105 ff., 110, 112, 402, 413, 430 ; Rhône and Cevennes, 422 ; Nisibis, 273, 364, 381, 386 ; Osrhoene, 365, 380 ; Persian, 202, 388
Decline in the West, v., 1 ff., 104, 401 ; over-centralization, 2 ; taxation, 2, 402 ; Huns and, 401, 413 f. (*see also* Attila) ; barbarian pressure, 78, 127, 138, 402 f., 417 ; attitude of barbarians to, 195, 447 ; progress of Goths and Burgundians, 415-18, 421 f. (*see also* Alaric) ; Suevi in Spain, 404, 406 ; Genseric in Africa (429), 194 f. ; temporary survival of Imperial Italy, 445 f. ; recovery of Western Numidia and the Mauritanias, 435 ; loss of Africa (455), 432 ; the Arian revenge, 433 ; sack of Rome by Genseric (455), 328, 415, 432, 446 f. ; the Empire under barbarian control, 448 ff., 451 ; its death scarcely perceived, 450, 469
Roman life : in Africa, 434 ; in Britain, 423 f., 428, 430 ; in Cappadocia, 372 f. ; settlements in the Caucasus, 361, in Cappadocia, 372 f. In Gaul : northern, 403, 414, 420, 424 ; under Syagrius (464), 415 ; effect of the Franks on, 403 ; in region of Arles, 406 f. ; under Euric (477), 422 f. In Spain, 407
The Probi, 131 ; Valerii Maximi, 132 ; life of Fabiola, 131 f. ; the Pontifex Albinus, 132 ; Publicola, 133 f. ; Pinianus' villa in Sicily, 135 ; estates in Africa, 135
Survivals of Paganism, 131 f., 134, 173, 259, 451
Tomb of the Apostles, 11, 137 ; cemeteries, 453. *See also* Churches
Rome, Church and City of :
Popes :—Eleutherius (177-89), 424 ; Pontianus (230-35), 160 ; Anteros (235-6), 160 ; Xystus II. (257-8), 46 ; Felix I. (269-74), *q.v.* ; Marcellus (307-9), 173 ; Miltiades (311-15), 84 ; Silvester (314-35), 451 ; Marcus (336),

Rome—*continued*
451; Julius (337-52), *q.v.*; Liberius (352-66), 85, 451 f.; Damasus (366-84), *q.v.*; Siricius (384-99 ?), *q.v.*; Anastasius I. (*c.* 399-401), *q.v.*; Innocent I. (402-17), *q.v.*; Zosimus (417-18), *q.v.*; Boniface (419-22), *q.v.*; Celestine (422-32), *q.v.*; Xystus III. (432-40), *q.v.*; Leo the Great (440-61), *q.v.*; Hilary (461-8), *q.v.*; Simplicius (468-83), *q.v.*; Felix III. (483-92), *q.v.*; Gelasius (492-6), *q.v.*; Symmachus (498-514), 456; Hormisdas (514-23), *q.v.*; Silverius (536-8 ?), 160; Vigilius (537-55), 123, 160; Gregory the Great (590-604), *q.v.*; Martin (649-53 ?), 160; Eugenius (654-7), 160
Tombs of the Apostles, 11, 137; traditional prestige of Rome, 20, 459; called by Eugenius of Carthage, *caput omnium ecclesiarum*, 439; origin of the title "Bishop of the Catholic Church," 459; the position of the Roman Pope and its basis, 459; influence in the East, 460 f., 465; custom of recourse to Rome for advice, 20 f., 117 f., 127, 234, 463; scope of Decretal Letters, 21, 123, 463; meaning of Siricius' ordinance on consecration of bishops, 130; condemnation of Origen's teaching by Anastasius notified to Milan, 43; ordinances of Roman Council (386) on ecclesiastical celibacy to Carthage, 82; rescript of Zosimus "ad universos totius orbis episcopos," 166; the authentic form of *Roma locuta est, causa finita est*, 158; Zosimus on the authority of his see, 165; his attitude to appeals, 165, 169 f.; the canons of "Nicæa," 170 ff., 175 ff., 179; Faustinus, legate of Zosimus and Celestine on the privileges of the Roman Church, 178; the Council of Carthage (423) on the Illuminations of the Holy Spirit, 179; Cyril and the "Most holy Father," and the submission of questions to the Holy See, 234; language of Roman legates at Chalcedon (451) in deprivation of Dioscorus, 304; of Felix III. in deposition of Acacius (484), 356; *Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum*, 321; the Apostolic See and the Christian brotherhood, 322, 357; ground of Leo's intervention in Mauritania Cæsariana, 435; Socrates on bishops of Rome and Alexandria, 453; the Roman Church and œcumenical authority, 465; defects of organization, 463, 465
Mother Church of Italy, 18 f.; relations
Rome—*continued*
with Milan (*q.v.*) and Aquileia, 129; with Ravenna, 130, 322, 463; in relation to peninsular Italy and the islands, 20, 130, 182, 462; the suburbicarian province, 21, 462 f.; strictness of regulation, 462; in relation to Illyricum (*q.v.*), 124-7, to Gaul (*q.v.*), 406-12; Vicariate of Arles, *q.v.*; Vicariate of Seville, 464; sending of the pallium, 464
Hierarchy of the Church, 159; imperial authority and papal elections, 173 f., 178; replacing of Popes, 160; priests, 173, 452; special position of deacons, 16, 173; official attitude to monks, 26, 125, 159, 196; laity consulted (*saec.* iii.) as to absolution of penitents, 15; "defensores," *q.v.*; administration, 453
Councils: the *natale ordinationis*, 19, 462; Council (378), 130, 411; (382), 463; (386), 21, 82, 130; (417), 162 ff.; (430), 234; (465), 21; (484), 355 f., 358; (487), 441
Damasus opposes election of Gregory Nazianzen at Constantinople, 126; condemns doctrine of "Two Sons," 222; his use of secular power, 453; the affair of Leontius of Salona and action of Council of Aquileia, 124; appeal of Councils of Carthage (397, 401) to Rome and Milan on admission of Donatists, 88 f.; Siricius and Innocent on the Bonosiaci, 123 f.; Siricius and the Vicariate of Thessalonica, 125 ff.; condemnation of Origen by Anastasius, 43; Innocent restores Bp. Photinus condemned by Anastasius, 127; letter of Theophilus to Innocent on deposition of Chrysostom, 71; appeal of Chrysostom to Rome, Milan, and Aquileia, 71; Innocent annuls sentence, 71; censure of Theophilus, 72; communion renounced with Chrysostom's opponents, 73, 156, 185; indifference of Theophilus, 203, 208; efforts of Council of Africa (407) at conciliation, 208; representations from Jerusalem as to Pelagius, 156, and from Africa, 157; Augustine on the reply, 158; Alexander of Antioch and Innocent (*c.* 415), 207 f., 250; reconciliation of Acacius of Berœa, 208
Zosimus establishes Vicariate of Arles, 161, 407; attempt to depose Proculus of Marseilles, 161 f.; letters of Pelagius and of Praylius of Jerusalem, 163; African expostulations, 164 f.; the *Tractoria*, and condemnation of Pelagius and Celestius, 167; inter-

Rome—*continued*
vention in Byzacene decision, 169; the case of Apiarius, 169-72; the policy of wisdom, 170, 179 f.; African protests, 172; condemnation of Julian of Eclanum, 183; letter of Atticus of Constantinople, 185; little regard for Roman decisions at Alexandria, 185, 203; Boniface annuls consecration of Maximus of Demetrias, 250; African protests as to Apiarius and Antony of Fussala, 176 f.; appeals from Gaul under Boniface, 408 f., and Celestine, 409. Celestine and Pelagianism in Britain, 188 f., 197, 425, 429; letters to bishops of districts of Vienne and Narbonne (428), 196, 409, and of Southern Gaul, 196, 409; Celestine on Augustine, 197; Atticus of Constantinople and Rome, 211 f.; the question of Illyria, 212; Nestorius and Rome, 229 f.; Rome and Nestorius, 232 ff.; Cyril and Celestine on Nestorius, 234 f., 238 f., 248; Cyril as Celestine's representative, 235, 237, 239, 243, 245, 256; doctrine of Rome and Alexandria, 235; Celestine on Jerusalem and Antioch, 238; legates to Ephesus (431), 242 f., 248, 288; their instructions, 248; approval of Nestorius' deposition, 248, 276; action as to the Easterns, 249; condemnation of Pelagians, 197, 249; report to Pope, 249 f., 257; notification of Maximian's succession, 257; Celestine and John of Antioch, 257, 259. Xystus III., popularity, 197; the deacon Leo and Julian of Eclanum, 199; Acacius of Berœa, 259 f.; Xystus and reconciliation of Cyril with John of Antioch, 264; letters of Eutherius and Helladius, 265; Proclus and Illyria, 275. Leo (*see* Leo). Hilary and the Gallican episcopate, 422; annuls decision of Spanish Council (465), 466. Simplicius and Alexandria, 354, 469; and Seville, 464; relations with Acacius of Constantinople, 346 f., 354. Felix III. and Acacius, 354 ff.; excommunication and deprivation of Acacius (484), 355 f.; notification of sentence, 358 f.; rupture of East and West, 357, 469. Gelasius on Nestorius, 312; on Pelagianism, 457

Rome, 85: sieges of, 94, 108, 138, 448; capture by Alaric (410), 46, 94, 104, 108, 136, 140; threats of Alaric, 106; the problem of the Fall of Rome, 136 f., 419; spoils presented to the daughter of Theodosius, 111; Rome and the barbarian menace, 110 f., 134 f.; the awe of Rome, 136, 413,

Rome—*continued*
448; Attila and Rome (452), 413; capture and sack by Genseric (455), 328, 415, 432, 446 f.; capture by Ricimer (472), 448 f.; the "Res Romana," 139, 415

Rufinus at, 36; Isidore of Pelusium, 39; fame of Augustine as orator at, 85; Rufinus the Syrian, 131; arrest of Eucharius, 107; Pelagius at, 145 ff.; Marcellinus, 146; Celestius, 148, 181; Pelagius expelled by government from "Rome," 167; Prosper and Hilary at, 196; popularity of Xystus at, 197; fame of Simeon Stylites at, 217; Ninian, 427; Novatians, 453 f.; Manicheans, 454 ff.

Prefect of (*see*, Prefect); Vicarius of, 130; proclamation of the Emp. John (423), 187; Emp. Anthemius at (467), 458

Bridge of Hadrian (Ponte di S. Angelo), 106; statue of Stilicho in Forum, 106; Arch of Triumph, 106; fortifications of Aurelian, 106; mausoleum of the Probi, 5, 131; Temple of Claudius, 131; Domus Pinciana, 142; Domus Merulana, 458

Aventine, 131, 452; Caelian Hill, 131 f., 134, 146, 168, 207; Esquiline, 452, 458; Quirinal, 452, 458; Suburra, 458; Trastevere, Trastevera, 137, 448

Rebaptism question after Ariminum (359), 77; Pelagian sympathies in Rome, 146, 157, 198 f.; the deacon Leo on position of Roman Church on Free Will, 199 f.; relation of Theodoret and Roman theology, 274; Romans as "Nestorians," 307, 310; Greek opposition to Roman demands as to Faith, 318, 323 f., 326, 340 f., 345, 349 f.

Epiphanius and the Roman Church, 36; view taken of Jerome, 35, 46 f.; influence of Eusebius of Cremona, 43; Victricius of Rouen and, 117 f.; Heros and Lazarus, 162 ff.; Paulinus the deacon and, 164; Council of Carthage (419) on appeals to, 86 f., 175 f.; Prosper on Xystus III., 197 f.; influence of Cassian, 230, 235

Roman Church and Arianism, 458 f.; Eutychianism, 457 f. Novatians, 453 f.; survivals of Pelagianism, 457

Roman Church and Council of Nicæa, 19, 72, 323, 465; and canons of Sardica, 19, 170 ff., 175 ff., 323; ignored Constantinople (381), 322; objections to canons of Chalcedon on jurisdiction, 321 ff.

Rome—*continued*
Roman Church and use of civil power, 453, 465 ff. *See also* Civil Power, Defensores
Church building, 451 ff. *See* Churches, Rome
Festivals, 161, 174, 293, 459
Romanus, Abbot of Tekoa (*saec.* v.): opponent of Chalcedon, 325, and of the Henotikon, 353; high character, 325; "Life," 317
Romanus, Count of Africa (*c.* 365), 82; appointed by Jovian, 78; cruelty and rapacity, 78, 80; persecutes Donatists, 78; revolt of Mauritania (372), 80; his failure and removal, 80 f.
Romulus, 459
Romulus Augustulus, Emp. (475-6), 449
Rouen. *See* Victricius
Rufinianæ, 214 f., 254
Rufinus, priest and monk (*c.* 345-410): native of Aquileia, 43; attitude to Origen, 29 f., 34, 38, 44, 75; friend of Melania the elder, 29 f., 43; her director, 134; acquaintance with Palladius, 29; with King Bacour, 361; relations with Aterbius (393), 31; friendship of John of Jerusalem for, 31 f., 44, 150; attitude of Epiphanius, 34; and of Jerome, 119; appeals to Theophilus of Alexandria, 35; reconciliation with Jerome (397), 36, 42; return to Rome, 36; translates for Macarius *Apology for Origen*, 36, and *Peri Archon*, 37; methods of translation, 36 f., 42; references to Jerome's work on Origen, 37, 42; relations with Pope Siricius, 37 f.; return to Aquileia, 37, 42; Pope Anastasius on his translations, 38, 44; letter to Jerome, 42; reply intercepted, 42, 44; Jerome's letter to Pammachius and Oceanus, 42-5; war with Jerome, 45, 47, 132; relations with Chromatius of Aquileia, 43, 45, with Paulinus, 43, 115, with Pammachius, 44, 146; Anastasius and Rufinus, 43 f., 159; his confession of Faith, 44; *Apology* to Apronianus, 44 f.; further translations, 45 f.; return to Rome, 134 f., 146; in Sicily, 135 f.; death there (410), 46, 136; animosity of Jerome, 45 ff., 74, 150; "Grunnius," 46, 151; revision of Canons of Nicæa, 86; on mission of Apostles, 397; "Ecclesiastical History" quoted, 325, 361, 395, 397 f.
Rufinus of Syria, priest (*c.* 390): at Rome, 131; his "Confession of Faith," 146; alleged intercourse with Pelagius, 146
Rufinus, the minister († 395): Prætorian Prefect, 50; baptized at "The Oak," 62; godson of Ammonius the Tall Brother, 39; his Villa, 62, 66; establishes monastery there, 215 (*see* Rufinianæ); guardian of Arcadius, 49; character, 49 f.; hostility of Stilicho, 49; ambitions frustrated by Eutropius, 49 f.; execution by Goths (395), 50
Rufinus, Prætorian Prefect (*c.* 394), 34
Rufus, Bp. of Thessalonica (*c.* 410-31), 184, 235, 251
Rural churches, 462
Rusticulus, Novatian bishop at Rome (*c.* 430), 453
Rusticus, Bp. of Narbonne (*c.* 451), 21
Rutilius Numatianus (*c.* 416), 190

SABA, Sabean, 396 f.
Sabellians, 313
Sabellius, heretic (*saec.* iii.), 203, 341, 380
Sabina, Basilica of, 452
Sacerdos, British representative at Arles (314), 424
Sacra: imperial letter, 236, 265, 352
Sacraments: clergy and, 15; bishops and regulation of, 25; in monasteries, 33, 36; Roman See consulted as to, 20
Sacred books, Manichean, 454, 456
Sacrifices, pagan, 112, 136
Safar, 399
Sahabad, 386
Sahag, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 363): of family of Bp. Albian, 372; signs Consubstantialist profession at Antioch, 372
Sahag the Great, Catholicos of Armenia, son of Narses (*c.* 390-441 ?), 268, 371, 375 f.
Sahag, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 380 ?): of family of Bp. Albian, 375
Sahag, Bp. of Reschdouni (*c.* 454), martyr, 377
Sailors, Egyptian. *See* Alexandria
Saints: cultus of, 8 f., 115, 191, *cf.* 343, 433; its motives, 9; of Old and New Testaments, 10; disclosed by revelation, 10
Saiazan, Sazan, brother of Aizan of Axoum (*c.* 356), 398
Salamis, 30, 33, 60. *See* Epiphanius
Salian, 418
Sallustius, Bp. of Seville (*saec.* vi.), receives pallium, 464
Salona: Bps. Maximus (*saec.* iv.), 124; Leontius (*saec.* iv.), 124, 130; Hesychius (405-29 ?), 21, 125; Glycerius (*c.* 473), 449
Salonius, son of Bp. Eucherius (*saec.* v.), 191
Salvation: Augustine's view of, 192; mystical view of, 223

Salvian, priest of Northern Gaul (*fl. c.* 429): at Marseilles, 419; *De Gubernatione Dei*, 419; contrasts barbarians and Romans, 139, 419
Salvius, Bp. of Membressa (*c.* 394), 84
Samosata, 353. *See* Andrew, Paul
Samuel, prophet, 33, 189; tomb of, 10
Samuel, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 432), 376
Sanctuaries, 299, 343, 433, 453
Sapor I., King of Persia (241-72), 394
Sapor II., King of Persia (309-79), 365, 378 f., 381 ff.
Sapor III., King of Persia (383-88), 386
Sara, 65
Saracens, 205, 395 f.; Bp. of, 396
Sardica, 123, 125 f.: Council (343), *q.v.* *See also* Protogenes
Sardinia, 432
Sardis, 221
Sassanids, 364, 369
Satala, 374
Satraps, 366, 376 f.
Saturninus, consul-designate (*c.* 399), 51, 54
Saturninus, eunuch (*c.* 449), 293
Savia, Province of, 124
Savoy, 402
Saxons, 414, 423, 430
Schahdost, Catholicos of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, martyr (342), 383
Schism, 34, 36, 68, 77, 84, 88 f., 99, 118, 123 f., 172, 207, 221, 305, 357, 391, 453, 460
Schnoudi, monk (*saecc.* iv., v.): of monastery on Upper Nile, 240; genuineness of Sermons, 240; alleged presence at Ephesus (431), 240; great age, 240; Cyrillian, 240; implacable hostility to Nestorius, 310; death (451), 315
Scholastici, 466
Schools, 373, 380. *See* Alexandria, Antioch, Bordeaux, Persians
Scipio, 104
Scodra, 125
Scoti, Scots: Jerome on, 145, 151; outside the Empire, 423; becoming Christian (431), 425, 429; St Patrick among, 426 ff., 429; cannibalism, 145
Scripture. *See* Bible
Sculpture, 11, 69, 130
Scupi, 125
Scythia, Scythians, 190, 363
Scythopolis. *See* Cyril, Severian
Sebaste, 201, 365, 375. *See* Atticus of Constantinople, Eustathius
Sebastian, Emp. (*c.* 412), 110
Sebastian, son-in-law of Count Boniface (*saec.* v.), 436
Sebastopolis, 361
Secretaries, 442. *See* Apocrisiarii
Secundianus, Bp. of Vibia (*c.* 484), 439
Seistan, 381
Selenas, Bp. of Goths (*saec.* iv.), 120
Seleucia in Asia Minor: Council (359), 440
Seleucia in Isauria, 300 f. *See* Basil
Seleucia in Syria, 342
Seleucia-Ctesiphon, 273, 381 ff., 384 f., 393 f.; Council (in 410), 386 f.; (in 420), 387. Bishops, *see* Persia
Seleucidæ, Seleucids, 363, 385
Seleucus (*c.* 354-281, B.C.), 385
"Semi-pelagianism," 191
Semitic, 379, 381, 385, 397
Senators, 131, 134, 234, 299, 413, 451, 468; of Carthage, 433
Senate, 66, 69, 85, 108, 138 f., 413, 447, 451, 455, 468 f.
Seneca (*saec.* v.), 457
Senior, 406
Septimius Severus, Emp. (193-211), 364 f., 385
Septimus, Bp. of Altinum (*c.* 450), 457
Septuagint, 152
Sepulchre, Holy, 5, 11, 36, 42, 381. *See* Anastasis
Serapeum, 329
Serapion, Archdeacon of Chrysostom (*saec.* v.): an Egyptian, 53; character, 53; and Epiphanius, 60
Serapion: Dialogue of Arnobius and, 198, 458
Serbal, 395
Serena, niece of Theodosius I.: wife of Stilicho, 49, 107, 135; friend of Pinianus and Melania, 135; butchered by Alaric (408), 108
Serendiv, 399
Sermons, 8, 240: long (of Epiphanius) 32, (of Hilary) 408; scriptural illustrations (of Chrysostom), 65, 67; of Catholic bishops in Africa, 434; of Nestorius, 220, 228 f.; of Cyril, 340; Peter Mongus preaches old sermons, 350; on special occasions (Faustus), 420; of Simeon Stylites, 217 f.; of Maximus of Turin, 128; of Pope Leo, *q.v.* *See* Preaching
Servi Dei, Christi, 167, 312, *cf.* 41
Services, 2, 5, 7 f.
Servile condition, 427
Severi. *See* Valerii
Severian, African bishop, exiled (437), 433
Severian, Severianus, British bishop (*saec.* v.): father of Agricola, 188; Pelagian, 188, 425
Severian, Bp. of Gabala (*c.* 400): preaching and accent, 54; hostile to Chrysostom at Constantinople, 54, 62; at the Oak, at Constantinople, 64, 69; in Syria, 67, 70, 73; Isidore of Pelusium on, 206

Severian, Bp. of Scythopolis (*c.* 451), murdered at Jerusalem, 326
Severus, Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch (512-19), 213
Severus: "Life," 317, 351
Severus, Bp. of Trèves (*c.* 447): in Britain, 189
Severus, L. Septimius, Emp. (193-211), 364 f., 385
Severus, Libius, Emp. (461-5), 415, 448, 468
Severus, ambassador of Zeno: in Africa (*c.* 474), 435
Severus, Sulpicius. *See* Sulpicius
Seville, 464. *See* Isidore, Sallustius
Sextus, Pythagorean philosopher, 46
Sheik, 395 f.
Shiites, 394
Shorthand, 65, 96
Shrine, 11, 299
Sicca Veneria, 96, 169, 172, 178. *See* Apiarius, Urbanus
Sicily: villa of Pinianus in, 135; death of Rufinus in (410), 46 f.; projected voyage of Alaric to, 109; Pelagianism in, 150, 182, 188; Fastidius in, 188; Maximin the Arian in, 122; invasion by Genseric (440), 122, 432. *See* Lilybæum
Sick: Fabiola's hospital at Rome, 132; Narses' in Armenia, 372 f.; Hilary and penitence *sub expectatione mortis*, 409
Side. *See* Amphilochius, Philip
Sidonius Apollinaris (431-89), Bp. of Auvergne (*c.* 470-89): great career as official, 404, 415 f., 418; son-in-law of Emp. Avitus, 416; bishop, 416; relations with Visigoths, 416, 418, 423; with ascetic nobles, 419; literary gifts, 415 f., 418; writings, 388, 416, 418, 420 f., 446
Sienna, 122
Sigeric, king of the Goths (415), seven days' reign, 111
Sigisharius, Bp. (*c.* 409), 121
Sigisvult, Count (*c.* 427-9): sent against Count Boniface, 194, 431; lands at Carthage (427), 121; accompanied by Bp. Maximin and band of Goths, 121, 194; retires before Genseric, 122, 194
Siglum, 10, 442
Silentiary, 330 f., 335
Silvanus, Bp. of Calahorra (*c.* 465), 406
Silverius, Pope (536-8 ?), 160
Silvester, Pope (314-35), Basilica of, 451
Silvia. *See* Etheria
Simeon, Bp. of Beth-Arsam (510-25), 392
Simeon Stylites (388-460): shepherd, monk at Antioch, Stylite, 216 f.; austerities, 216 f.; his pillar, 217; widespread fame, 217; monastic criticisms, 217; sermons, 217 f.; consulted by Theodosius II., 260; consulted officially on doctrine after Chalcedon, 218, 335; Theodoret and, 216 f., 266; copied by Daniel the Syrian, 344; burial, 218
Simon Magus, 304
Simon Barsabæus, Bp. of Seleucia-Ctesiphon (*c.* 326-41): supplants Bp. Papa, 385; decision of the "Western Fathers," 385; martyred (341), 382 f., 385
"Simonians": Nestorians, 267
Simony, 55
Simplician, Simplicianus, Bp. of Milan (397-400), 89; his converts, 128; succeeds Ambrose, 127; Pope Anastasius notifies to him condemnation of Origen's works, 43; death (400), 43, 128
Simplicius, Pope (468-83): and Acacius of Constantinople, 354, 357, 469; letters of Acacius, 330, 346; alarm at restoration of Timothy Aelurus by Basiliscus, 469; letter to Emp. Zeno (477), 345; disturbed at concourse of bishops at Constantinople, 345; drops the question of Arles, 422; letters of Vicariate to bishop of Seville, 464; sees the end of the Empire, 469; death, 354, 469
Simplicius, Bp. of Vienne (*c.* 397-417), 117
Simplicius, Bp. (*saec.* v.): Sidonius Apollinaris on, 417
Sinai, 205: monks of, 326; monastery of St Catherine, 395; bishopric of, 395; Theodosius of Jerusalem at, 327. *See* Nilus
Sin: Augustine's view of, 143, 151; view of Pelagius, 144, of Celestius, 148; attitude of Pelagius to Celestius, 154; Jerome's view, 151; Baptism and, 5 ff.
Original sin: Augustine on, 143, 150, 168; followed by Bossuet, 145; Catholic doctrine of, 145, 165. View of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 146, 185; of Pelagius, 144; of Celestius, 148 f.; of Faustus of Riez, 421 f.; of Julian of Eclanum, 184 ff.; of St Leo, 457; of Dialogue of Arnobius and Serapion, 458. *See* Fall
Transmission of sin, 148 f., 186; problem of infant baptism, 149, 157
Relation to prayer, 157; and doctrine of Redemption, 149, 192. *See also* Salvation
Sinhala dvipa, 399
Siricius, Pope (384-399), 89, 131; attitude to Epiphanius, 36; and Rufinus, 37 f., 159; to Paulinus of

Nola, 43 ("superba discretio"), 115; on ecclesiastical celibacy, 82; on Felix of Trèves, 118; on Bonosus, 123; founds Vicariate of Thessalonica, 125 f., 464; on the consecration of bishops, 130, 462; repairs churches, 452; death, 38; character, 37, 115, 134; succeeded by Anastasius, 38
Sirmium: Formula of (357), 424. *See also* Photinus
Sisinnius, Bp. of Constantinople (425-7): demanded by the people, 219; consecration, 212, 219; letter to Beronician and Amphilochius, 212; consecrates Proclus Bp. of Cyzicus, 219, 242; Pope Celestine on, 235, 257; death, 220; character, 219, 235, 257; succeeded by Nestorius, 220, 235
Sisters, Spiritual, 52
Sitifis, 94
Sivas, 365
Slaves: Christian, 15, 427; as monks, 24; Vandal punishment of Catholics, 433 f.
Slavs, v., 125, 127, 401
Socotora, 400
Socrates, historian (*saec.* v.): as historian, viii., 51, 66, 210, 220, 387, 453; quoted, 38 f., 61, 65 f., 120, 209, 219 f., 228, 245, 267, 271, 328, 361, 388; date of history, 267
Soissons, Battle of (486), 415
Solitaries: of Chalcedon, 215, 328; Constantinople, 344; Egypt, 39, 193, 205, 210; (*see* Nitria); of Gaza, 395; of Palestine, 141, 216; of Provençal coast, 419; (*see* Lérins); of Sinai, 205; of Syria and Euphrates country, 213, 216, 266, 274, 344; of Tuscan coast, 190. *See* Ascetics, monks
Somalis, 396
Somme, 402
Sophene, 363 f., 365 f., 370
Sophia, St, at Constantinople, 61, 65, 228: Eutropius takes refuge in (399), 50 f.; statue of Eudocia in front of, 66; burning of the Church, 69, 72; Chrysostom leaves, 69; effort of Timothy Aelurus to enter, 338; Acacius drapes throne and altar in black, 344; sentence of Pope Felix III. pinned on his pallium in, 359; *spoudaioi* of, 5
Sophist, 201
Sophronius, Bp. of Tella (*saec.* v.), 291, 296
Soukoum, 360
Soul, 28, 151, 186, 222, 421
Sourmag, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 428), 376
Souster, 386
Sozomen, historian (*saec.* v.): as historian, viii., 51; quoted, 10, 61, 65 f., 79, 109, 120, 201, 367, 383 f., 395
Spain, 407; rival Emperors in, 109 f.; Goths, 109, 111 f., 120; favourable view of, 139; Vandals, 194 f., 358, 401 f., 430 f., 432; "Andalusia," 194 f., 402, 430 f.; Suevi in, 402; appeals to Aetius, 403; Majorian attacks Vandals, 415, 448; Britons in, 423; people of Tipasa take refuge in, 442; Visigoths in, 450
Church of: reference of disputes to Rome and Milan, 20; Decretal Letters to, 21; Priscillianists in, 112 f., 404 f.; ordination of Paulinus at Barcelona, 114, 141; pilgrimages from, to Nola, 115; Bonosiaci in, 123; bishops of "Mauritania Tingitana," and African Council (418), 165; Turribius of Astorga, 404 f.; Hydatius, 404 f.; circulation of letters of Flavian and Leo, 412; Pope Hilary annuls Spanish Council, 466; papal *defensores* in, 466 f. *See also* Galicia, Lusitania, Seville
Spaniards: monks, 312; Catholics at Vandal Court in Africa, 436. *See also* Orosius
Spires, 107, 402
Spoleto: proposed Council, 173 ff. *See* Achilleus
Sporacius, *Comes Domesticorum* (*c.* 451), at Chalcedon, 299
Spoudaioi, 5
Stamboul, Old, 202
Station, 7
Statues, 66, 69, 130
Stephen, St, tomb of, 10
Stephen, Bp. of Antioch (478-80), 343
Stephen, Bp. of Ephesus (*c.* 449-51), at Chalcedon, 299 f.
Steward, 250, *cf.* 17, 148
Stilas, Dux of Egypt (*c.* 458), 336
Stilicho (*saec.* v.): of Vandal descent, 107; general of Theodosius I. marries his niece Serena, 49, 107; his son Eucherius, 107; marries two daughters to Emp. Honorius, 107; brother-in-law of Count Bathanarius, 89; control of the West, 49, 107; his Eastern policy, 49 f., 73, 125; relations with Alaric, 50, 73, 105 f., 107 f.; and Gainas, 50; defeats Alaric at Pollentia (402), 73, 106, *cf.* 134; receives statue in Forum, 106; relations with Gildo and Mascezel, 85; Court intrigues against him, 107; troubles in Gaul, 107; poems of Claudian on his victories, 115; assassination by order of Honorius, 94, 107 f., by Heraclian, 99
Stoechadae, 191

Stoicism, 144, 183
Strasbourg, 107
Strathclyde, 427
Strikes, 24
Style, 113, 115, 204, 418, 428
Stylites, 217, 344. *See* Simeon, Daniel
Subdeacons, 16, 164
Subregulus, 427
Substantia, 224
Suburbicarian jurisdiction, 21, 462 f.
Suburra, 458
Succession, Vandal, 438, 443
Successus, Bp. of Diocæsarea in Isauria (*c.* 431), 281 f.
Suevi: cross the Rhine (406), 106; settle in Galicia and Lusitania, 402; Aetius uses Goths against them, 403; Rechila and Rechiar kings at Emerita, 404 f.; internal and external wars, 406; with Vandals, 430; paganism, 404, 406. *See* Ricimer
Sufetula, 439. *See* Præsidius
Suicide, 81, 85, 102, 346
Sulpicius Severus (*saecc.* iv., v.): native of Aquitaine, personal history, 116; retired life, 5, 190, 419; at Toulouse, 118; devotion to St Martin, 116; controversy with Britius, 116; relations with Paulinus of Nola, 115 f.; with Postumianus, 118; and Vigilantius, 118 f.; influence of Pelagianism on, 188; account of British bishops at Ariminum (459), 425; works, 116, 118; elegance of style, 113; personal character, 115 f., 118, 188, 419
Supernatural, 426
Superstition, 413
Susa, 385 f.
Susiana, 381 f., 384, 386, 392
Syagrius, Spanish bishop (*c.* 433), 405
Syagrius, son of Aegidius: establishes principality in N.W. Gaul (464), 415, 469; Sidonius Apollinaris on, 415
Sycæ, 328
Syene, 72
Symbolum Fidei, 149. *See* Creeds
Symmachus, Pope (498-514), 456
Symmachus the elder, Prefect of Rome (304): in conflict with Ambrose, 173; pagan, 173; work of Prudentius against, 131
Symmachus, Prefect of Rome (*c.* 418-19): nephew of Symmachus the elder, 173; pagan, 173, 451; sides with Eulalius (419), 173; removes him, 174; relations with Achilleus of Spoleto, 174
Synaos, 395. *See* Agapitus
Synesius, Bp. of Ptolemais (411-14?): early life and abilities, 203 f.; pupil of Hypatia, 203 f., 210; relations with Theophilus of Alexandria, 203 f.; bishop (411), 204; ideals, 204; on relations between Rome and Alexandria, 208; his brother and successor Euoptius, 253; correspondence, 204 f.
Synodicon: its history, 221, 270; signatures to Cyril's Acts at Ephesus, 247, 249 f.; on Juvenal of Jerusalem, 251; on Cyril's *douceurs*, 261; quoted, 258 ff., 262, 264, 266 ff.
Synodus, 166
Syracuse, 150
Syria, 393, 397; Huns in, 34, 50; fugitives from Rome (410), 137; Alexander the Acœmete, 213 f.; Aristolaus sent to, 259, 263; Paul of Emesa, 263; Peter the Iberian in, 353; Arab tribes near, 394; refugees from Africa in, 433; forces of Mahomet in, 226; deserts of, 72, 213; Bedouins, 217
Strength of Christianity in (*saecc.* iii., iv.), 370; cultus of angels in, 10. Monks, 23, 297, of Mesopotamian Syria at *Latrocinium* (449), 287, their character, 287
Bishops of, 19; divisions as to Chrysostom, 67, 208; at Council of Antioch (381), 222; and Nestorian controversy before Ephesus, 237; letter of Cyril to, 238; delay in reaching Ephesus, 243, proceedings there, 246 f.; at Chalcedon (431), 253; their theological tradition, 266, 274, 393; their view of Cyril, 271 f.; at *Latrocinium*, 340; at Chalcedon, 299; (Canons 9, 17), 320; their metropolis Antioch, *q.v.*; attitude to monks, 328; alleged ordination of Peter the Fuller at Seleucia, 342; growth of Monophysitism, 346; acceptance of Emp. Leontius, 352; influence of Acacius of Constantinople, 357
Syriac, vi., 394; MSS. vii., 384; Maruthas a Syriac-speaking Mesopotamian, 62; "Book of Heracleides" in, 221; hymns of Balai, 264; works of Ibas of Edessa, 273; Acts of the *Latrocinium*, 279, 286; *Historia Miscellanea*, 316, 334, 339; Life of Peter the Iberian, 325, 328; Life of Isaiah by Zacharias, 354; his history, 358; books translated into Armenian, 376; use of, in Armenian liturgy, 370; Edessa, a Syriac-speaking centre, 379, 384; teachings of Aphraates, 381, 384; Martyrologies in, 384; "Hirta," 394
Syrian, Syrians: commercial colonies of, 128; Rufinus the Syrian at Rome, 131, 146; clergy of Nestorius at Constantinople, 228; Simeon, Varadates,

James, 335; Daniel the Syrian at Constantinople, 344; Daniel Catholicos of Armenia, 372; Perkischo and Samuel, 376; Syrian masters in Armenia, 373, 376; "Syrian" colonies of Alexander, 399; *Scriptores Syri*, 328, 354. *See also* Michael, Syriac

Tabraca, 85, 178. *See* Apiarius
Taktika, 375
Tall Brothers, 39, 215. *See also* Ammonius, Dioscorus
Talmud, 380
Tamalleni, Turris, 441
Tapestry, 34, 261
Taposiris, 332
Tarantaise, 412
Taron, 369
Tarraconensis, province, 405, 466
Tarragona, 21, 406. *See* Ascanius, Himerius
Tarsus, 67; Council (431), 258 f.; Empress Verina crowns Leontius at, 351; bishopric of, 258, 353. *See* Diodore, Helladius
Tatian, Apologist (*saec.* ii.), 379
Tatian, Prefect of Constantinople, at Chalcedon (451), 299
Tattooing, 437
Taurianus, Cretan (*saec.* v.), 127
Tauric Chersonese, 360
Taurobolium, 112
Taurus, 320, 337
Tayyaye, 389
Taxation: imposed by Heraclian on fugitives to Africa, 140; Receivers of Taxes as assessors to a Council, 169; ecclesiastical in Egypt, 272; victims of the Treasury in Gaul and Spain, 402; of Africa lost (455), 432
Tchiboukli, 214
Te Deum, 127
Teima, 397
Tekoa, 325, 353. *See* Romanus
Telanissos, 218
Telepte, Council (418), 87
Tella, 386, 435. *See* Sophronius
Tell Neschin, 218
Telmin, 441
Temple, 262 f. *See* Christology
Temples: proposal to re-open, 136 f.; servants of, 369; endowments of, used for Armenian clergy, 371; closed but standing at Rome (*saec.* v.), 130, 451
Terdjan, 369
Tertullian (*c.* 160-240), 113, 225, 436
Tetrapylon, 332
Teutons, 106
Thaddeus, St, 367
Thagaste: birthplace of Augustine, 85, 92; Pinianus and Melania at, 141. *See* Alypius, Augustine
Thalassius, Bp. of Angers (*saec.* v.), 414
Thalassius, Bp. of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia (*c.* 439-51 ?): former Prætorian Prefect, 328; made bishop by Proclus, 328; Dioscorian, 285, 300 f., 307; at Chalcedon (451), 299; excuses for *Latrocinium*, 300; deposition recommended by officials, 301 f.; share in commission for definition, 307; attitude to the Canons, 321; to George the monk, 328; "a man of peace," 328, *cf.* 321
Thamugad: Donatist centre, 82, 102; its position, 102; Dulcitius at, 102. *See* Gaudentius, Optatus
Theatres, 4, 138, 329
Thebais, Thebaid, province, 240, 310
Thenæ, 121
Theoctistus, Bp. of Cæsarea in Thessaly (*saec.* v.), 250
Theodora, Church of, at Rome, 173
Theodore, Bp. of Antinoe (*saec.* v.): consecrates the deacon, Peter Mongus, Bp. of Alexandria (477), 346, 350; at head of 30,000 monks, 350; exile, 353 f.; "Life," 325, 354
Theodore, Bp. of Fréjus (*c.* 432-55), 25
Theodore, Bp. of Mopsuestia (392-428): friend of Diodore of Tarsus, 222; Christology of, 222 f.; possible influence on Pelagius, 146; welcomes Julian of Eclanum, 185, 229; attacks Jerome and Augustine, 185, 207; Nestorius and, 268, 312; in relation to Antiochene theology, 344, 393; efforts of the deacons Basil and Maximus against, 269, 277; influence in Cilicia, 261, and at Edessa, 273, 391, *cf.* 393; works translated into Syriac, 273; attitude of Armenian monks, 270; of bishops of Persian Armenia, 390, and of Theodoret, 274; Mari the Persian and, 273; on good terms with Cyril, 232; Cyril's work against him, 269 f.; his "Creed" at Ephesus (431), 250; attacks of Marius Mercator on, 185, 284, and of Eutyches, 278; on "natural sinlessness," 185, 207; Apollinarianist attack on, 228; commentary on Job, 232; work against Magi of Persia, 388; death, 229
Theodore, St, sanctuary of, 343
Theodore, Roman deacon, 51
Theodore the Reader, historian (*saec.* vi.), viii.; fragmentary remains, viii., 317; on consecration of Anatolius, 294; on accident to Timothy Aelurus, 338; quoted, 217, 342
Theodore, Augustal Prefect (*c.* 451), 329

Theodoret, Bp. of Cyrrhos (†*c.* 457): native of Antioch, 274, 340; knowledge and eloquence, 253; pastoral activity and influence, 274; sermons, 279; admiration for monks, 274; on Simeon Stylites, 216 f.; opposition of Barsumas to, 277; attack on Eutyches, 278; attacked by Theodosius and the monks, 279; friend of Nestorius, 266; manifest orthodoxy, 256, 312 f.; his theology, vi., 274, 278, 286, 317, 344, 390; refutation of Cyril's Anathemas, 239, 256; later attitude to Cyril, 261 ff., 271 (?), 273; member of Eastern deputation to Chalcedon (431), 253; disputation with Acacius of Melitene, 254; attitude to Himerius of Nicomedia, 258; to John of Antioch, 253, 266; compelled to sign condemnation of Nestorius (435), 268; censured by Irenæus of Tyre, 270; welcomes refugees from Africa, 433, 435; confined to his diocese, 279, 287, 292; forbidden to attend Council of Ephesus (449), 285, 287; deposed there, 291, 340, 348; appeals to Pope Leo, 292; Leo's intervention, 292; letter of Leo to, 293; restored by Leo, 300, 309; relegated to a monastery, 294; at Council of Chalcedon (451), 300; his "censure" on Nestorius, 309; "Nestorian," 313; defends Leo's doctrine, 317; Letter of Leo to (453), 341; date of death, 341; reference to him in Henotikon, 348

Works, vii., 274; collection of patristic texts, 254; *Eranistes*, 254, 278; Letters, 271 (?), 275, 390, 433, 435, 456; as historian, viii., 51; quoted, 207, 271, 387 f.

Theodoric the Amal, the Great, son of Valamir, chief of the Ostrogoths: invades Italy for Zeno against Odoacer, 450; supplants Odoacer (493), 450; character and policy, 451, 467

Theodoric the Squinter, chief of the Ostrogoths (*saec.* v.), 450

Theodoric II., king of the Visigoths (453-66): "ally" of the Empire, 447; with Aetius relieves Orleans (451), 413; king at Toulouse, 447; proclaims Avitus Emperor (455), 447; succeeded by his brother Euric (466), 416

Theodoric, brother of Huneric, king of the Vandals (*saec.* v.), still alive (477), 438

Theodosian Code. *See* Codex

Theodosiopolis, 353, 365, 375

Theodosius, Bp. of Jerusalem (452-3 ?): leads monks to Alexandria against Domnus and Theodoret, 279; treatment by Dioscorus, 279, 324; foments agitation against Juvenal of Jerusalem, 324; supplants him as bishop, 326; attitude to Eutyches, 327; ejected by government, 327; relations with Peter of Iberia, 332; ordains him Bp. of Maiouma, 390; interned in monastery of Dius, 328; death at Constantinople (457), 328; buried in Cyprus, 328

Theodosius the Deacon: collection of canons, 171

Theodosius I., Emp. (379-95), 10, 33, 109, 111, 173, 215, 331, 415, 446, 467; son of the General Theodosius, 81; governor of Illyrian provinces under Gratian, 125; his achievements, 1; growth of influence of Constantinople under, 56; calls Œcumenical Council there (381), 319; agreement with Persia (*c.* 387), 365, 382, 386; legislation as to Arians, 53, 120; as to heretics generally (392), 92, 222; puts down usurpation of Eugenius (*c.* 394), 84 f.; battle of the Frigidus (394), 105, 361; brings Goths to Italy, 50; relations with Stilicho, 49, 107; his niece Serena, 107; his daughter Placidia, *q.v.*; death, 49; succeeded by Arcadius and Honorius, 1, 49

Theodosius II., son of Arcadius, Emp. (408-49), 300: proclaimed Augustus (402), 201; succeeds Arcadius at age of 7 (408), 107, 201; story as to Jazdgerd I., 387; power of Anthemius, 201 f., 448; war with Persia (420-2), 388; marriage to Athenais Eudocia (421), 276; attitude to his sister Pulcheria, 236, 252, 276; relations with Placidia, 187; his character and piety, 202, 206; Theodosian enclosure at Constantinople, 202; Isidore of Pelusium on, 206; attitude to Cyril, 236; summons Council of Ephesus (431), 236; represented by Count Candidian, 242; letters to him from members of Council, 246, 249, 262; new representation by Count John, 251; accepts sentence of deposition of Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon, 251; influences upon him, 252 f., 276; orders conference at Chalcedon (431), 253; invites Cyrillians to Constantinople, 254; attitude to the Council, 255, 276, 278; letters to Acacius of Berœa and Simeon Stylites, 260; allows return of Chrysostom's remains, 271; influence of Chrysaphius, 276, 310 f.; schemes

of Dioscorus as to, 276 f.; attitude to Domnus of Antioch and Irenæus of Tyre, 278 f.; and to Theodoret, 279, 292, 309 f.; writes to Pope Leo for Eutyches, 284; attempts to reconcile Flavian and Eutyches, 285; summons a new Council (449), 285; exacts Confession of Faith from Flavian, 285; Leo and the Emperor, 286; the imperial programme, 287 f.; Dioscorus' report of the *Latrocinium*, 291; letter of Leo, 292; formal approval of Council's decisions, 293, 325, 412; edict against Flavian and for Eutyches, 324; relations with Athenais Eudocia, 276, 325; their daughter Eudoxia, 276, 293, 451; restoration of "Church of the Apostles" at Rome, 452; death (449), 295, 311

Theodosius, general (*saec.* iv.), 82; father of Theodosius I., 81; quells insurrection of Romanus in Africa, 81

Theodosius, son of Athaulf and Placidia (*c.* 415), 111

Theodosius (*saec.* v.): at Hyères, 191

Theodotus, Bp. of Ancyra (*c.* 430-9): at Ephesus (431), 245; Cyrillian 253, 258

Theodotus, Bp. of Antioch (420-9): successor of Alexander, 208; attitude to Pelagius, 168; to Chrysostom's memory, 208, 211; to Alexander the Messalian, 214; death (429), 237

Theodotus, Bp. of Nicopolis (*c.* 373), 374

Theodotus of Byzantium (*saec.* ii.), 123

Theodulus, son of Nilus the Sinaite, (*saec.* iv.) 205

Theognostus, Augustal Prefect of Egypt (*c.* 482), 348

Theology: and religion, 13. *See also* Christology

Theophanes, Bp. of Philadelphia (*c.* 431), 250

Theophanes, historian (*saec.* ix.): his "Chronicle," viii.; quoted, 333, 343, 352 f., 359

Theophilus, Bp. of Alexandria (385-412): position in Egypt, 56 f., 272; friend of John of Jerusalem and Rufinus, 35; not anti-Origenist, 35, 38; sends Isidore to Palestine, 35; tries to make him bishop of Constantinople (398), 39, 52, 58; consecrates Chrysostom, 52; relations with Epiphanius, 36, 41, 59 f.; letters to Pope Siricius, 36; attacks anthropomorphism, 38; monastic disturbances, 38; attacks Origenism, 38; quarrels with Isidore, 38 f.; the Tall Brothers, 39, 42 [55, 59], 66; oppression of Origenists, 40 f.; his victims go to Palestine, 41 f.; to

Theophilus—*continued*
Constantinople, 42, 55; letter to Pope Anastasius (400), 41; to bishops of Palestine and Cyprus, 41; relations with Chrysostom, 58 f., 61, 66, 242; with the Court, 59, 61 f., 70; at the Synod of the Oak (403), 62 ff., 211; deposition of Chrysostom, 64, 243, 248, 298, 346, 460 f.; Theophilus at Constantinople, 64 f., 66; return to Alexandria, 66; relations with Rome, 36, 71 f., 203, 208, 461; Jerome translates his works, 74; he returns to reading Origen, 74 f., *cf.* 203; relations with Atticus of Constantinople, 202; with Synesius, 203 ff.; death (412), 208; succeeded by his nephew Cyril, *q.v.*; quoted at Council of Ephesus (431), 245; his character and ability, 35, 39, 42, 52, 58, 209, 231, 256; Isidore of Pelusium on, 206

Paschal (Festal) Letters (399), 38; (400), 40; (401), 40, 74; (402, 404), 74

Theophilus Blemmyas, the Indian (*saec.* iv.): Arian, envoy of Constantius to Axoum, 398 f.; journey to Divou, 399; Christians there, 399 f.

Theotokos. *See* Christology

Theresa, wife of Paulinus of Nola 43, 114 f.

Thermantia, daughter of Stilicho, wife of Emp. Honorius, 107

Thérouanne, 403

Thessalonica: metropolis of Macedonia, 125; Council of Sardica (343) and, 125 f.; priests of, at Rome, 72; projected Council there, 72; delegation by Pope Siricius to Bp. Anysius, 126; the "Vicariate," 126 f., 161, 464; letter of Atticus of Constantinople as to Pelagius, 162; *Tractoria* of Zosimus sent to, 181; letter of Julian of Eclanum to Bp. Rufus, 184; result, 185; letter of Celestine, 235; relation of Maximus of Demetrias to, 250; appeal of Eutyches to, 283; letter of Leo to, 334

Bishops: Alexander (*c.* 325), 126; Aetius (343-4), 126; Heremius (*c.* 359), 126; Acholius (*c.* 380-3), 126; Anysius (*c.* 383), 72, 126; Rufus (*c.* 410-31), *q.v.*; Stephen (449-51), 299 f.; Anastasius (*c.* 451), 21, 299

Thessaly: province, 125, 334; and Council of Ephesus (431), 249 f.

Thil, 369

Thomas, St: Journey in India, 400; Apocryphal Acts, 404

Thortan, 369

Thospa, 362

Thrace, 124; "diocese" of, 320 f., 334,

357; province, 20; Huns in, 50; Gainas in, 51; Bp. Selenas and Goths in, 120; convent of Halmyrissos, 215; bishops of, at Chalcedon, 299; jurisdiction of Constantinople and, 321, 357; armies in, 351
Three Chapters. *See* Chapters
Tiber, 446
Tiflis, 361
Tiglath Pileser III. (*c.* 745-27 B.C.), 363
Tigranes III. (*c.* 95-60 B.C.), 363 f.
Tigranocerta, 363 f.
Tigris, 128, 362, 365, 379, 383, 385 f., 394
Timasius, pupil and opponent of Pelagius, 152, 164
Timber, 441
Timotheus, priest of Constantinople, 213
Timothy, Bp. of Alexandria (380-5), brother of Athanasius, 58
Timothy Aelurus, Monophysite bishop of Alexandria (457-77): present with Dioscorus at *Latrocinium* (449), 330; Cyrillian, 330; deposed by Proterius, 330; his theological position, 330 f.; consecrated bishop by Eusebius of Pelusium and Peter of Maiouma, 332, 390 f.; exile and recall, 332; treatment of Chalcedonians, 332 f.; petition to the Emperor, 334; his intrusion condemned by bishops, 334; refusal to sign Leo's second doctrinal letter, 335; in exile, 317, 336; leaves Monophysites at Alexandria to Peter of Iberia, 337; loss of Aspar's protection, 337; recalled by Basiliscus, 338, 343, 469; relations with Acacius of Constantinople, 338, 344, 346, 348; and autonomy of Ephesus, 339; return to Alexandria, 339 f.; restores remains of Dioscorus, 340; attitude of Zeno to, 345 f.; death, 346, 354; writings, 317, 336; the *Plerophoriae*, 310, 315, 317
Timothy Salofaciol, Bp. of Alexandria (460-82): elected by Proterians, 336; attitude of people, 336 f.; replaces Dioscorus on diptychs, 337; retires to Canopus, 339; pension from Timothy Aelurus, 340; recalled, 346; attitude of Pope Simplicius, 354; rivalry of Peter Mongus, 346 f.; sends John Talaia to Constantinople, 347; death (482), 348, 354; succeeded by John Talaia, 348; name removed from diptychs, 349 f.; body removed, 350; character, 336 f., 346
Tipasa, 77, 442. *See* Reparatus
Tirechan, Irish bishop (*saec.* vii.), 425 f.
Tiridates, King (*c.* 261-317), 367 f., 373
Tituli, 452
Titus, Emp. (79-81), 380
Titus, Roman deacon, 407
Tkôou, 298. *See* Macarius
Tobit, Book of, 10
Toledo: collection of Homilies at, 293. *See also* Councils
Toleration, 387, 398, 437, 454, 457 f.
Tombs, 5, 10 f., 66, 137, 191, 241, 350, 380, 453. *See* Catacombs, Cemetery
Tome. *See* Leo, Proclus
Tongres: Franks at, 105; bishopric, 403
Torture, 210, 433, 442
Toulouse, 21, 117, 161; Sulpicius Severus at, 118; Goths at, 402, 415 f., 447. *See* Exuperius
Tournai: Franks at, 402; bishopric, 403
Tours, 116: Council (461), 414. *See also* Britius, Gregory, Martin
Toxandria, 402
Toxotius (*saec.* v.), son of St Paula, husband of Læta, 132
Trade, 385, 396, 398 f. *See* Commerce
Tradition: in relation to history, 426; the Roman, 358, 459 f., 468; the Christian, vi., 13 f., 198; in relation to Pelagianism, 144, 184; in relation to Christology, 223, 225, 274, 282
Traditors: Donatists and, 77, 91; Council of Angers (453) on deliverers of towns to the enemy, 414
Traducianism, 186, *cf.* 148
Trajan, Emp. (97-117), 14, 385
Trasamund, king of the Vandals (496-523), 443
Trastevere. *See* Rome
Travel, 397 f.
Travellers, Home for, 132
Traz-oz-montes, 405
Treason, 414 f.
Trebigild: revolt of Goths under, 50; unites with Gainas (399), 51, 105
Trent, 129. *See* Vigilius
Trèves: civil history, 403, 407; ecclesiastical, 403. *See* Felix, Leporius, Severus
Tribe: in Britain, 424
Tribune, 455; and notary, 259, 268, 287, 314 f.
Tricio, 406
Trinacria, 47. *See* Sicily
Trinity, the: Athanasius and Basil on, 225; Augustine on, 121; Pelagius on, 146; the term "Hypostasis," 223 ff.; Proclus on, 269; Christological formula under Justinian, 318; in the Henotikon, 349; Ajax, 406
Tripoli, 439
Tripolitana, 83
Trisagion, 301, 352
Tritium, 406
Triton, Lake, 441
Trocundus, Isaurian, brother of Illus (*saec.* v.); relations with Zeno, 344 f.; and Pamprepius, 351

Troilus, sophist (*c.* 408), 201
Trophimus, Bp. of Arles (*saec.* i.), alleged founder of see, 161
Troy, 136
Troyes and Attila's invasion, 413. *See* Lupus
Trygetius, Senator (*c.* 452), 413
Tuapse, 360
Tuentius, identity of, 409
Tunic, 409
Tun[n]unum, 345, 442. *See* Victor
Turbantius, Italian bishop (*c.* 418), Julian of Eclanum and, 186
Turin: Council of (*c.* 400), 117 f. *See* Maximus
Turkestan, 217
Turks, 217, 378
Turribius, Bp. of Astorga (*saec.* v.), and Priscillianists, 404 f.
Turris Tamalleni, 441
Tuscany, Tuscia, 129, 190
Tutus, "ecclesiastical advocate" (484), 356, 358 f.
Two Natures. *See* Christology
Tyana. *See* Anthimus, Eutherius
Tychonius, Donatist (*c.* 372): on treatment of "Traditors," 77; on Seven Rules of Interpretation, 79; on the Apocalypse, 79
Tyre, 433: Council (335), 126; Conference as to Ibas (449), 283, 309; in province of Phœnicia, 261; Meropus the explorer, 397; Frumentius and Ædesius, 397 f. *See also* Irenæus, John Codonatus, Photius
Tyrrhenian Sea, 130
Tysedis, 77

Ulfilas, Bp. of the Goths (*saec.* iv.), 121
Ultan, Irish bishop († 656), 425
Unction, Holy, 131
Union, Formula of (433). *See* Creeds
Unity, Christian, 238, 357 f., 458 f.
Uranius, Bp. of Himeria in Osrhoene (*c.* 445-51): friend of Eutyches, 277; intrigue against Ibas of Edessa, 277, 279, 283
Urbanists, 80
Urbanus, Bp. of Sicca Veneria (*c.* 418): formerly priest of Hippo and pupil of Augustine, 169; the affair of Apiarius, 169 ff.; Pope Zosimus and, 170 f.; action of Council of Carthage (419), 175 f.
Uriel, Archangel, cult of, 10
Ursinus, Anti-Pope (366), 453, 466
Ursus, tribune (*c.* 421), 455
Urthanes, son of Gregory, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 314 ?), his family, 371
Usthazanes, Persian official, martyr (341), 383
Usury, 384
Utica, 438
Uzala, 193. *See* Evodius
Uzès, 407, 411, 417. *See* Constantius

Vahak'n, 369
Vahan the Magus. *See* Mamigouni
Vaison: Council of (442), 408
Valamir, Ostrogoth chief, 450
Valarschapat, capital of Armenia (*saec.* ii.), 364; martyrs at, 368; Council of (491), 391
Valence, 408, 412
Valens, Emp. (364-78), 71, 221; government of Egypt under (368), 57; difficulties with Persia, 365, 373; supports Pap in Armenia, 373 f.; relations with queen of the Saracens, 395; catastrophe (378), 54, 125
Valentia, province, 423
Valentia, 123. *See* Justinian
Valentinian I., Emp. (364-75): Law of (368), 17; maintains Julian's policy, 77; intervention in Africa, 81; victories over barbarians, 105; prosperity under, 134; letter to Prefect of Rome, 466
Valentinian II., Emp. (375-92): restores Basilica of St Paul without the walls, 452; his sister Galla, 49
Valentinian III., Emp. (425-55), 448, 468; son of Placidia and Honorius, 187, 293, 401; aged six at accession, 401; a "palace Emperor," 445; government of Placidia (425-50), 401, 445; marries Eudoxia, daughter of Theodosius II. and Eudocia, 276, 293, 328, 451; his daughters Eudocia, 445 f., and Placidia, 446; relations with Constantinople, 293; with Genseric (454), 435; assassinates Aetius (434), 414, 445; massacred (455), 328, 432, 445 f.; family carried off by Vandals (455), 328, 447
Rescript to Aetius (445), 411, 466; law for Numidia and Mauritania (445), 435; law against Manicheans (445), 455 f.
Valentinus, Bp. of Chartres (*c.* 390 ?), 118
Valentinus, heretic (*saec.* ii.): Eutyches treated as follower of, 282
Valeria, province of, 124
Valerian (*c.* 418), alleged influence on Cyril, 185
Valeria, Gens, its branches, 132, 133. *See also* Publicola
Valerii Maximi: palace of, 132
Valerius, Bp. of Hippo († 396), 86
Valerius, Count (*saec.* v.), piety and influence, 183 f., 185; relations with Julian of Eclanum, 183, and Augustine, 186
Van: Lake, 362; town of, 363

Vandals, 138, 448, 465; dress, 437 f.; Arians, 122, 195, 433; in Gaul (406-8), 106 f., 430; in Spain (Andalusia), 194 f., 402, 430 f.; Genseric in Africa (429), 194 f., 431; siege of Hippo (430), 195 f., 431; position of Capreolus, 243; exile of Catholics (437), 433; martyrdom of Spanish Catholics of the Court (437), 436; capture of Carthage (439), 358, 432 f., 455; cession of provinces to (435, 442), 432, 435; invasion of Sicily (440), 122, 432; piracy, 432, 447; Genseric and Catholics of Carthage (454), 435; sack of Rome (455), 328, 415, 432, 435, 446 f.; Leo and Genseric, 446; imperial captives, 328, 331, 432, 447; masters of Africa, 103, 243, 358, 432; attitude to Roman administration, 434; effect on relations of Rome and Africa, 196, 230, 467; new threat to Italy (456), 447; Majorian and Vandals in Spain (*c.* 461), 415, 448; expedition of Basiliscus (468), 432; delight in persecution, 417, 431, 433 f.; ecclesiastical policy of Genseric, 436 f.; accession of Huneric (477), 437; persecution of Manicheans, 437 f.; attitude to Catholics (481), 437; ferocity to his relatives, 438; persecution of Catholics, 438; summons Conference (484), 438 f.; its sequel, 440 f.; apostasies, 441 f.; martyrdoms, 442; death of Huneric (484), 443; attitude of Guntamund to Catholics, 443, and of Trasamund, 443; toleration by Hilderic (523), 443; records of the persecution, 431, 443 f.
Kings: Table of, 443; Gonderic (*saec.* v.), 430 f.; Genseric (*c.* 428-77), *q.v.*; Huneric (477-84), *q.v.*; Guntamund (484-96), 443; Trasamund (496-523), 443; Hilderic (523), 443
Vannes, Council of (465), 414
Varadatus, Baradatus, Syrian solitary (*saec.* v.), 266, 335
Varela, 406
Vasag, Marzban of Armenia (*c.* 450), 377
Vatican. *See* Basilica
Venantius, brother of Honoratus (*saec.* v.), 190
Venerandus, Bp. of Auvergne († *c.* 423), 117
Venerius, Bp. of Marseilles (*c.* 431-51), letter of Pope Celestine to, 196, 409
Venerius, Bp. of Milan (401-11?), formerly deacon of Ambrose, 128; letter of Pope Anastasius to, 43; relations with Africa, 89
Venetia, 206; province, 129; Attila in (452), 413; Pelagians in, 457
Veranus, son of Eucherius (*saec.* v.), 191
Vercellæ, 128. *See* Eusebius
Vercingetorix, 416
Verenianus, kinsman of Theodosius (*c.* 408): rising in Spain, 109
Vergil, 136
Verina, Empress (*saec.* v.): widow of Emp. Leo sets up Zeno, her son-in-law (474), 337; sets up her brother Basiliscus (475), 337; at Papyrion, 351; sets up Leontius as Emperor 351 f.
Verona, 128 f.: Alaric at (402), 106; Constantine III. at (409), 109; Attila at (452), 413. *See* Zeno
Verulamium, 424
Vespasian, Emp. (69-79), 363, 365
Vestina, Roman matron, builds S. Vitale at Rome, 452
Via Appia, 135
Via Labicana, 446
Vibia, 439. *See* Secundianus
Vicariate, 464. *See* Arles, Thessalonica
Vicarius, 167: of Africa, position of, 78, 81, 91; of Rome, 130; of Pontus, 320. Ecclesiastical, *see* Arles, Thessalonica
Vice-Emperor, 342, 407, 450
Vicentia: Attila at (452), 413
Victor, St, martyr of Marseilles (*saec.* iii.), 191
Victor of Tunnunum (*saec.* vi.), 345, 442
Victor, Bp. of Vita (*saec.* v.): *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae*, its character, 438, 443 f.; referred to, 431, 437, 439, 441 ff.
Victorinus, C. Marius (*saec.* iv.): Neoplatonist, 85; conversion by Simplician, 85, 128; relations with Augustine, 85 f.
Victorius, Count (*saec.* v.), Governor of Auvergne under Euric, 418; Catholic, 418
Victricius, Bp. of Rouen (*c.* 390?-409): soldier, 117; friend of St Martin, 117 f.; missionary zeal, 117; in Britain (*c.* 395), 117, 425; relations with Pope Innocent (404), 21, 117 f., 130; Sulpicius Severus on, 118; Paulinus of Nola and, 117; Innocent's *Liber Regularum*, 21, 117 f., 130
Vienne: civil metropolis, 161; relation to Arles, 161, 410, 411 f.; Gerontius at, 110; Burgundians at, 415; monastery at, 24. *See* Avitus, Mamertus, Simplicius
Viennensis: province, 161; letter of Pope Celestine to bishops of, 21, 196, 409; letter of Pope Leo to, 410; jurisdiction of Arles over, 161, 407, 410; Pope Leo's division between

Arles and Vienne, 412; subject to Burgundians, 421
Vigilantius, priest, disciple of Sulpicius Severus (*saecc.* iv., v.), 118; at Nola and in Palestine, 119; in controversy with Jerome, 10, 119 f., objection to cultus of relics, 9, 119 f.; his personal history, 119 f.
Vigilius, Pope (537-55), 123, 160
Vigilius, Bp. of Trent (*c.* 385), 129
Vigils, 7, 53, 68, 119, 127
Viminacium, 125
Vincent, Bp. of Cartenna (*saec.* v.), 80
Vincent, priest, monk at Bethlehem (*c.* 394), 33
Vincent, monk of Lérins († *c.* 450): ability, 196; in controversy with Prosper, 195 f.; the *Commonitorium*, 198; *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* directed against Augustine, 198
Vincomalus, Master of the Offices: at Chalcedon (451), 299
Vinegar, 91, 442
Virgins, consecrated, 3, 127: at Rome, 26; in Africa, 141; attitude of Donatists to Catholic, 77; in Ireland, 427; their veil, 141; Demetrias, 140 f.; Eustochium and Paula, 156; St Geneviève, 217, 413; Hripsime and Gaiane, 368. *See also* Celibacy
Virovesca, 406
Visigoths, 448, 467; as members of the Roman family, 417, 447; conquests in Gaul, 417, 450; in Spain, 450; capital at Toulouse, 416; persecution in Gaul, 417; compared with Odoacer's Germans, 418; British auxiliaries at Bourges and, 420; Council of Arles (473-4) and, 421 f. *See* Euric, Theodoric
Visions, 426
Vita in Byzacena. *See* Victor
Vitale, S., Basilica of, at Rome, 452
Vitalis, Bp.: legate of Pope Felix to Acacius of Constantinople (483), 355
Vitalis, Spanish monk (*saec.* v.), 312
Vitalis, notable of Carthage (*c.* 420), 193
Viviers, 417
Voices, 426, 428
Volusianus, uncle of Melania: Prefect of Rome, 181; at Constantinople (436), 451; baptized when dying, 451
Vosges, 105
Vulgate, 143. *See* Bible

WALLIA, Gothic chief (*c.* 416), 111
Walls of Hadrian and Antoninus, 423, 427
Widows, 52, 410
Wills, 419, 440
Witchcraft, 291
Withorn, 427
Women, 120: influence of, 83 f.; (*see* Hypatia); in Ireland, 427 f.; compositions of, 114, 276; literary studies, 325
Worms, city of, 107, 402
Worms, 443
Writing, 362, 370

XENAIAS, Philoxenus (*c.* 431), Cyrillian, 392
Xystus II., Pope (257-8), martyr; writings attributed to, 46
Xystus III., Pope (432-40), 452: reported Pelagian sympathies when priest, 157, 197; change of attitude, 168 f., 193, 197; letter of Augustine to (418) 193; succeeds Pope Celestine (432), 197, 265; popularity, 197; Prosper of Aquitaine and, 197 f.; application of Julian of Eclanum to (*c.* 439), 199; influence of the deacon Leo, 199, 467; intervention in division between Alexandria and Antioch, 259, 461; letter to Acacius of Berœa, 259 f.; joy at Cyril's reconciliation, 264; letter of Eutherius and Helladius to, 265; protests against encroachments of Proclus in Illyria, 275; rebuilding of Lateran baptistery, 453; restores its ciborium, 137; founds monastery in Rome, 26; restores Liberian basilica, 452

YATHRIB, 397
Yemen, 396 f.
York, 424. *See* Eborius

ZACCHÆUS, 192
Zacharias of Gaza, rhetor, Bp. of Mitylene (536-53): his history, viii., 316; monophysite standpoint, 316; tendency to exaggerate, 315, 336; on death of Nestorius, 315; on Anastasius of Jerusalem and the Anti-Encyclical, 344; history quoted, 326 f., 328 ff., 331 f., 334 f., 337, 339, 346 ff., 353, 358; biographies of Peter of Iberia, Theodore of Antinoe, and Isaiah, 325, 354; and of Severus, 351; becomes Bp. of Mitylene and orthodox, 316
Zaven, Catholicos of Armenia (*c.* 378), 375
Zechariah: tomb of, 10; Jerome on, 117
Zend, 366
Zeno, Bp. of Verona (*saec.* iv.), 129
Zeno, Emp. (474-91): Isaurian, becomes Patrician, marries Ariadne, daughter of Emp. Leo, 337; Vice-Emperor at Antioch, 342; patronizes Peter the Fuller and the Monophysites, 342 (*cf.* 338); crowned by his son Leo (474), 337; orthodox influence of Acacius, 338; representations to

Genseric for Catholics of Africa (*c.* 474), 435; loses the throne (475), 337, 343; wins over Illus and Trocundus, 344 f., 347; regains the throne (476), 345, 347; treatment of Basiliscus, 345; dominant influence of Acacius, 347, 355, 357; representations to Huneric for Catholics of Carthage (481), 437; the Henotikon (482), 348, 350, 355; recognition of Peter Mongus at Alexandria, 348 f.; disagreement with Illus, 347, 351; Illus and Verina proclaim Leontius Emperor, 351 f.; reprisals of Zeno, 352; Pope Felix and the situation, 355; Reginus in Africa (483), 439; correspondence with Babowai Catholicos of Seleucia (484), 390; "supports" Theodoric the Amal against Odoacer in Italy, 450

Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra (*saec.* iii.), 364

Zenonis, wife of Emp. Basiliscus, 338

Zeugitana, 434

Zeuxippus: Baths of, 240

Ziata, 364

Zichia, bishopric of, 361

Zokoum, Sheik, 395

Zosimus, Pope (417-18), 187, 409: antecedents, 159 f.; Pelagian sympathies (*c.* 415), 157; becomes Pope (417), 159; characteristics of his rule, 159, 172, 180; influence of Patroclus of Arles, 160 ff., 257; the Vicariate of Arles, 161, 407, 422, 464; protests aroused, 161 f.; attitude to Heros and Lazarus, 162 f.; the case of Celestius, 162 ff., 165; approves Pelagius, 163 f.; the deacon Paulinus, 164; remonstrances from Africa, 164 f.; action of Council of Carthage (418), 165 ff.; intervention of the Government, 166 f.; the *Tractoria* condemning Pelagius and Celestius, 167, 199; their reception in the East and in Italy, 181 f., 185; Zosimus and Augustine, 167 f.; deposition of Julian of Eclanum, 183; Decretal Letter on monks to Hesychius of Salona, 21, 125; censures Byzacene Council, 169; the case of Apiarius, 169 f.; papal legates at Carthage, 170 f., 175; the African bishops and the "Nicene" canons, 171 f., 175 f., 179; Prosper on, 197; death (418), 172; burial in S. Lorenzo, 173

Zosimus, historian (*saec.* v.), 51: pagan, 137; on proposal to re-open temples at Rome, 136 f.; quoted, 361

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

FROM ITS FOUNDATION TO THE END OF THE FIFTH CENTURY

By MONSIGNOR LOUIS DUCHESNE

DE L'ACADÉMIE FRANÇAISE, HON. D.LITT. OXFORD, AND LITT.D. CAMBRIDGE, MEMBRE DE L'INSTITUT DE FRANCE

VOLUME 1.—Commencing with the Roman Empire, the Home of Christianity, this volume narrates the Origin of the Roman Church, deals with Religion in the Greco-Roman state, the Spread of Christianity, and brings the history down to the Reaction at the end of the Third Century. 12s. net.

VOLUME 2.—The Fourth Century. The author here unravels the story of parties and Controversies of this period—the Great Persecution, the Councils of Nicæa and Ephesus, the figures of Athanasius, Ambrose, Hilary of Poitiers, the Conflicts at Rome between Pope Damasus and Ursinus. 15s. net.

VOLUME 3.—The Fifth Century. This, the concluding, volume deals with what is *par excellence* the century of the Fathers of the Church—Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, and their Contemporaries, and the Controversies of their times. 21s. net.

PRESS OPINIONS

"It is needless to say that his work is marked by learning and accuracy. At every step we have the satisfaction of knowing that no statement is made for which there is not abundant evidence, that no judgment is expressed which is not the result of ample knowledge and unbiassed reflection."—*Westminster Gazette.*

"Monsignor Duchesne writes with a vivacity which is characteristically French, and with a certain *diablerie* which more than once recalls Gibbon."—*Guardian.*

"A comprehensive and luminous account of the Church history of the period, which will have permanent value for both Catholics and Protestants."—*Christian World.*

"He has a surpassing gift of lucid eloquence. . . . He is with us, one of us, a modern scholar writing for modern appetites."—*Expository Times.*

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF BELIEF

By CHARLES GORE, D.D.

Formerly Bishop of Oxford

I. BELIEF IN GOD

II. BELIEF IN CHRIST

III. THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE CHURCH

With the issue of Volume Three, Dr Gore has completed his study on The Reconstruction of Belief. After a consideration of the idea of the Religion of the Spirit of the Church as it is presented in the New Testament, Dr Gore offers what he thinks is the true and original idea of authority in religion, and concludes by showing the bearing of his conclusions on the problems of the present day.

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net each

PRESS OPINIONS

"Notwithstanding all criticism, it remains that Dr Gore is unquestionably the leading figure in the Church of England to-day. . . . A study of his work to-day will be of the greatest value. He helps us to see things as they really are."—*Church Times.*

"With his habitual honesty he faces the facts of the present situation. . . . He establishes the fact that in the Hebrew prophets there is a firm declaration at once of the righteousness and of the love of God."—*Guardian.*

"Dr Gore is invariably fair; he writes with conviction; and he has the knack of imparting interest to his discussions."—*Glasgow Herald.*

"His lucidity in defining his reconstructed beliefs will impress all impartial readers."—*Yorkshire Post.*

"Dr Gore is a great gift to the whole Church."—*Sunday Times.*

"He writes with such depth of conviction and sincerity that his words have peculiar force. He is certainly in knowledge and profundity the leading English theologian of the day, and he has the gift of simple and clear exposition."—*Daily Mail.*

Other Works by

CHARLES GORE, D.D.

Formerly Bishop of Oxford

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE CHURCH
The concluding volume in the Reconstruction of Belief Series. 7s. 6d. net.

BELIEF IN CHRIST
The second volume in the Reconstruction of Belief Series. 3rd Impression. 7s. 6d. net.

BELIEF IN GOD
The first volume in the Reconstruction of Belief Series. 11th Impression. 7s. 6d. net.

THE EPISTLES OF ST JOHN
An exposition similar to the widely read volumes on The Sermon on the Mount, The Romans, and The Ephesians. 2nd Impression. 6s. net.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT
A practical exposition based upon a careful study of the original text. 20th Impression. 5s. net. Paper Covers, 1s. 6d. net.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS
A practical exposition to enable the reader to make use of one of St Paul's Epistles. 9th Impression. 5s. net.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS
A practical exposition written with the same aim as "The Epistle to the Ephesians." Two Vols. 7th Impression. 5s. net each.

THE INCARNATION OF THE SON OF GOD
Being the Bampton Lectures for the year 1891. 14th Impression. 5s. net.

THE BODY OF CHRIST
An Enquiry into the Institution and Doctrine of Holy Communion. 10th Impression. 6s. net.

DISSERTATIONS ON SUBJECTS CONNECTED WITH THE INCARNATION 3rd Impression. 5s. net.

ORDERS AND UNITY
The author here argues that the episcopate is the necessary and divinely given link of continuity and cohesion in the Church universal. 5s. net.

THE NEW THEOLOGY AND THE OLD RELIGION
Being Eight Lectures together with Five Sermons. 2nd Impression. 5s. net.

THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH
Being Four Lectures delivered in June 1892, in the Cathedral Church of St Asaph. 2nd Edition. 5s. net.

SPIRITUAL EFFICIENCY 2nd Impression. 1s. net.

THE PERMANENT CREED AND THE CHRISTIAN IDEA OF SIN
Being two Sermons preached before the University of Oxford. 6d. net.

LUX MUNDI
Edited by Charles Gore, D.D. A series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation. 21st Impression. 6s. net.

Works by the

Right Rev. A. C. HEADLAM

C.H., D.D., Bishop of Gloucester

THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS THE CHRIST

The Church will be very grateful to Dr Headlam for this account. It is a trustworthy guide ; it is always written with reverence and enthusiasm ; the style is remarkably direct and lucid. Third Impression. 12s. net.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN REUNION

THE BAMPTON LECTURES, 1920. "As a teacher and writer, Dr Headlam has always been distinguished for clearness of thought and logical consistency, and his latest work possesses in a marked degree both these characteristics."—*Church Family Newspaper.* Second Edition, with a new Preface. 12s. net.

THE MIRACLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

BEING THE MOORHOUSE LECTURES FOR 1914, DELIVERED IN ST PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, MELBOURNE. "His treatment appears to great advantage when he comes to deal with the authenticity and trustworthiness of the New Testament documents. No better or fairer statement could be desired."—*The Times.* 6s. net.

HISTORY, AUTHORITY, AND THEOLOGY

The object of these Essays has been to answer, primarily for the writer's own satisfaction, certain questions which any thoughtful person who considers the religious problems of the present day must put to himself. 6s. net.

ST PAUL AND CHRISTIANITY

" We have pleasure in recommending this study of St Paul as an independent analysis of his writings, giving a valuable estimate of their teaching as it appears to a scholar of recognized standing among ourselves."—*Church Family Newspaper.* 6s. net.

THE REVENUES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

In this work the author examines the Revenues of the Church of England in relation to the work that it has to do, and suggests a scheme for the reorganization of its endowment. He defends the incomes and palaces of Bishops, and condemns, as the great evil of the Church, the inadequate incomes of the parochial clergy. 2s. 6d. net.

NOTABLE BIOGRAPHIES.

LORD BYRON'S CORRESPONDENCE.

Chiefly with Lady Melbourne, Mr. Hobhouse, the Hon. Douglas Kinnaird and P. B. Shelley. Edited by John Murray, C.V.O. "A just and careful edition of letters that add to our knowledge of Byron and our admiration for his writing."—*The Times.* With Portraits. Second Impression. 2 Volumes. 25s. net.

MEMORIES OF THE XIXth CENTURY.

By the Earl of Meath, K.P., G.B.E. "Remarkable for the quality and quantity of anecdotes collected by the author, whose travels in Europe, America, and Australia and experience in the Foreign Office make him a most interesting raconteur."—*Evening News.* Portraits and Illustrations. 18s. net.

JANE WELSH CARLYLE

Letters to her Family 1839–1860. Edited by Leonard Huxley, LL.D. No woman ever excelled Mrs. Carlyle as a letter writer. The discovery of a great store of her still unpublished letters is therefore an event of first-rate literary importance.

A ROMANCE OF THE XIXth CENTURY.

Compiled from the letters and family papers of Baliol, Viscount Esher. By Major C. H. Dudley Ward, D.S.O., M.C. A series of authentic letters and documents, beginning with the love letters of Dora Best, in the days of Napoleon the Great, to George Brett. With Illustrations. 15s. net.

THE PRIME MINISTERS OF BRITAIN 1721—1921.

By the Hon. Clive Bigham. "His volume is a perfect treasure-house of good things, well and appositely set forth . . . a truly delightful piece of historical writing, plenteous without being stodgy." —*Spectator.* With full-page Portraits of each of the 36 Prime Ministers. Third Impression. 21s. net.

THE CHIEF MINISTERS OF ENGLAND 920—1720.

By the Hon. Clive Bigham, C.M.G., C.B.E. "Of romantic and picturesque quality, a book it would be difficult to over-praise. Rich in the fruits of reading and research, sober and just in judgment." —*Sunday Times.* With 28 Portraits and Illustrations. 21s. net.

BY SIR HENRY LUCY.

THE DIARY OF A JOURNALIST—I.

"Brisk effervescent collections of good stories, pungent criticism, and sometimes sombre reflection that leave the reader unwearied after the most prolonged attack on its pages."—*Daily Chronicle.* Second Impression. 15s. net.

THE DIARY OF A JOURNALIST—II.

Later entries. "As full of good stories as its predecessor, and all of them freshly told . . . a feast of good things, carefully recorded and told with point and enjoyment."—*Evening Standard.* Portrait. 15s. net.

THE DIARY OF A JOURNALIST—III.

Fresh extracts. This third volume, like its predecessors, is compiled of extracts from Sir Henry's private diary, entered at the dates given and remaining unedited. It may therefore be assured to offer to the reader the same interest as did the other two earlier volumes. 12s. net.

MEMOIRS.

With a Full Account of the Great Malaria Problem and Its Solution. By Sir RONALD ROSS. "His book is one that should be inwardly digested by every student of Empire and by every science worker."—*Daily Telegraph.* Illustrated. 24s. net.

JOHN ADDINGTON SYMONDS.

Addressed Chiefly to Henry Sidgwick and Horatio F. Brown. By HORATIO F. BROWN, Author of *History of Venice*, etc. "Like nearly everything that comes from his pen, they wield a fine spell that obscures all their faults while we read."—*The Times.* Portrait. 12s. net.

THE LIFE OF SIR WILLIAM WHITE.

By FREDERIC MANNING, Author of *The Vision of Brunhild.* His life covers the whole period of naval construction from the beginnings of steam propulsion and of the building of iron ships to the opening of the Dreadnought era, and the fitting of the *Mauretania* with turbines.
With Illustrations.

LIFE OF ADMIRAL OF THE FLEET SIR ARTHUR WILSON, V.C., G.C.B., O.M.

By Admiral Sir EDWARD BRADFORD, K.C.B., C.V.O. The life story of one of the most distinguished British sailors, who was one of those mainly responsible for the splendid efficiency of our Fleet in 1914 and afterwards. With Illustrations.

CATHERINE DE MÉDICIS QUEEN OF FRANCE.

By PAUL VAN DYKE, Professor of History, Princeton University. This life of Catherine de Médicis is the result of ten years' work and study of the sources. Two Volumes. With Illustrations. £2 2s. net.

LADY ROSE WEIGALL.

A Memoir based on her Correspondence and the Recollections of Friends. By her Daughter, RACHEL WEIGALL. Lady Rose Weigall was the last survivor of the intimate friends of the Duke of Wellington and his contemporaries, and from her earliest years lived in the centre of the most distinguished society. Illustrated. 15s. net.

PEOPLE AND PLACES.

By ARTHUR KEYSER. "He has the gift of telling what he remembers with the neatness of form which often makes the difference between a mediocre story and a good one."—*Times.* 16s. net.

TRIFLES AND TRAVELS.

By ARTHUR KEYSER. "The writer is a gay raconteur who has seen most of the civilised world and has a good story to tell of every place he has visited."—*Daily Chronicle.* 10s. 6d. net.

THE LIFE AND WORK OF SIR JAMES KAY SHUTTLEWORTH.

By FRANK SMITH, Lecturer in Education, University of Aberystwyth. Introduction by Sir MICHAEL SADLER, K.C.S.I. "A contribution of permanent value to the history of elementary education and social conditions following the industrial revolution."—*The Times.*
With Illustrations. 18s. net

BR
165
.D8213
1909
V.3

CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL UNION
BR165.D82 C001 V003
EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH L

3 0311 00013 6049

7654

WITHDRAWN

9105

0311 00013 6045